arXiv:1409.5699v1 [math.LO] 19 Sep 2014

The Σ_1-Provability Logic of HA

Mohammad Ardeshir*, S. Mojtaba Mojtahedi†
Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Sharif University of Technology

September 22, 2014

Abstract

In this paper we introduce a modal theory H_σ which is sound and complete for arithmetical Σ_1-substitutions in HA, in other words, we will show that H_σ is the Σ_1-provability logic of HA. Moreover we will show that H_σ is decidable. As a by-product of these results, we show that $\mathsf{HA}+\Box\bot$ has de Jongh property.

Contents

1 introduction **2**

2 Definitions and conventions **4**

3 Arithmetic **5**
3.1 Some arithmetical preliminaries . . . 6
3.2 q-Realizability and Leivant's principle . . . 9
3.3 The extended Leivant's Principle . . . 11
3.4 Interpretability . . . 13

4 Propositional modal logics **13**
4.1 The NNIL formulae and related topics . . . 14
4.1.1 The NNIL-algorithm . . . 15
4.1.2 The TNNIL-algorithm . . . 17
4.1.3 The TNNIL^--algorithm . . . 18
4.2 The Box Translation . . . 19
4.3 Axiomatizing the TNNIL-algorithm . . . 20
4.4 TNNIL-Conservativity of LC over LLe^+ . . . 21
4.5 Kripke semantics for LC . . . 23

5 Transforming Kripke models **25**
5.1 Definition of the Solovay function . . . 26
5.2 Elementary properties of the Solovay function . . . 28
5.3 Deciding the boxed formulas . . . 29
5.4 The Solovay function is a constant function . . . 32
5.5 Proof of the main theorem . . . 35

6 The Σ_1-provability logic of HA **36**

*mardeshir@sharif.ir
†mojtahedy@gmail.com

1 introduction

As far as we know, there are at least two updated reliable sources [AB04], [BV06], for current situation, historical background and motivations for *provability logic*. In order to our paper to be self-contained, in this introduction, we extract a brief backgrounds of provability logic from the mentioned sources for readers not much familiar to the subject.

provability Logic is a modal logic in which the modal operator $\Box$ has intended meaning of provability in some formal system. Unlike the other realms of modal logic, e.g. temporal logic, epistemic logic and deontic logic, here in provability logic, we have a rational meaning for $\Box A$: "A is provable in the system T".

The notion of *provability logic* goes back essentially to K. Gödel [Göd33] in 1933, where he intended to provide a semantics for Heyting's formalization of *intuitionistic logic* IPC. He defined a *translation*, or *interpretation* τ from the propositional language to the modal language such that

$$\mathsf{IPC} \vdash A \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \mathsf{S4} \vdash \tau(A).$$

The translation $\tau(A)$ adds a $\Box$ before each sub-formula of A. The idea behind this translation is hidden in the intuitionistic meaning of truth (the BHK interpretation): "The truth of a proposition coincides with its provability". Hence if one assume $\Box A$ as "provability of A", then it is reasonable to add a $\Box$ behind each sub-formula and expect to have a correspondence between the intuitionistic propositional calculus IPC and some classical modal logic.

On the other hand, by works of Gödel in [Göd31], for each arithmetical formula A and recursively axiomatizable theory T (like PA), we can formalize the statement "there exists a proof in T for A" by a sentence of the language of arithmetic, i.e. $\exists x \mathsf{Prov}_{_T}(x, \ulcorner A \urcorner)$, where $\ulcorner A \urcorner$ is the code of A. Now the question is whether we can find some modal propositional theory such that the $\Box$ operator captures *provability* in classical mathematics. Let us restrict our attention to the part of mathematics known as Peano Arithmetic, PA. Hence the question is to find some propositional modal theory $T_{\Box}$ such that:

$$T_{\Box} \vdash A \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \forall * \ \mathsf{PA} \vdash A^*$$

By $(\ )^*$, we mean a mapping from the modal language to the first-order language of arithmetic, such that

- p^* is an arithmetical first-order sentence, for any atomic variable p, and $(\bot)^* = \bot$,
- $(A \circ B)^* = A^* \circ B^*$, for $\circ \in \{\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$,
- $(\Box A)^* := \exists x \mathsf{Prov}_{\mathsf{PA}}(x, \ulcorner A^* \urcorner)$.

It turned out that $\mathsf{S4}$ is *not* a right candidate for interpreting the notion of *provability*, since $\neg\Box\bot$ is a theorem of $\mathsf{S4}$, contradicting Gödel's second incompleteness theorem (Peano Arthmetic, PA does not prove its own consistency).

In 1976, R. Solovay [Sol76] proved that the right modal logic, in which the $\Box$ operator interprets the notion of *provability in* PA is GL. This modal logic is well-known as the Gödel-Löb logic, and has the following axioms and rules:

- all tautologies of classical propositional logic,
- $\Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\Box A \rightarrow \Box B)$,
- $\Box A \rightarrow \Box\Box A$,
- Löb's axiom (L): $\Box(\Box A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \Box A$,
- Necessitation Rule: $A / \Box A$,
- Modus ponens: $(A, A \rightarrow B)/B$.

Theorem 1.1. (Solovay) *For any sentence A in the language of modal logic,* $\mathsf{GL} \vdash A$ *if and only if for all interpretations* $(\ )^*$, $\mathsf{PA} \vdash A^*$.

There are many open problems which could be assumed as a generalization of the above theorem. A list of such problems could be found in [BV06]. Also a live list of open problems could be found in the homepage of Lev Beklemishev[1].

The question of generalizing Solovay's result from classical theories to intuitionistic ones, such as the intuitionistic counterpart of PA, well-known as Heyting Arithmetic, HA, proved to be remarkably difficult [AB04]. This problem was taken up by A. Visser, D. de Jongh and their students. The problem of axiomatizing the provability logic of HA remains a major open problem since the end of 70s [AB04]. Precisely speaking, the problem of the provability logic of HA is as follows:

$$\text{Find a modal theory } \mathsf{H} \text{ such that:} \quad \mathsf{H} \vdash A \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \forall * \ \mathsf{HA} \vdash A^*$$

Note that in the above statement of the provability logic of HA, we have $(\Box A)^* := \mathsf{Prov}_{\mathsf{HA}}(\ulcorner A^* \urcorner)$. The following list contains important results about the provability logic of HA with arithmetical nature:

- Friedman 1975. $\mathsf{H} \nvdash \Box(A \vee B) \to (\Box A \vee \Box B)$, [Fri75]
- Leivant 1975. $\mathsf{H} \vdash \Box(A \vee B) \to \Box(\boxdot A \vee \boxdot B)$, in which $\boxdot A$ is a shothand for $A \wedge \Box A$, [Lei75]
- Visser 1981. $\mathsf{H} \vdash \Box\neg\neg\Box A \to \Box\Box A$ and $\mathsf{H} \vdash \Box(\neg\neg\Box A \to \Box A) \to \Box(\Box A \vee \neg\Box A)$, [Vis81, Vis82]
- Iemhoff 2001. Introduced a uniform axiomatization of all known axiom schemas of H in an extended language with a bimodal operator $\rhd$. In her Ph.D. dissertation [Iem01], Iemhoff raised a conjecture that implies directly that her axiom system, iPH, restricted to the normal modal language, is equal to H, [Iem01]
- Visser 2002. Introduced a decision algorithm for $\mathsf{H} \vdash A$, for all A not containing any atomic variable. [Vis02]

In this paper we introduce an axiomatization of a modal logic H_σ and prove the following result which partially answers the question. We show that for any modal proposition A, which has no nested implication to the left (TNNIL-formula), A is in the Σ_1-provability logic of HA, iff $\mathsf{iGL}{+}\mathsf{CP} \vdash A$, where iGL is the intuitionistic Gödel-Löb's logic and CP is the *completeness principle* $B \to \Box B$ (this theory is named in this paper as LC). This in combination with the conservativity result of Theorem 4.23 and also some variant of Visser's NNIL-algorithm in [Vis02], implies that the Σ_1-provability logic of HA is a decidable modal theory, that is called H_σ here. More precisely, we find a system H_σ such that

$$\mathsf{H}_\sigma \vdash \mathsf{A} \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \forall * \ \mathsf{HA} \vdash \mathsf{A}^*,$$

in which, $*$ range over all of the substitutions that p^* is a Σ_1-sentence for atomic variables p. It is worth mentioning that a non-modal variant of all the axioms of H_σ, were already discovered by Visser in [Vis81, Vis82, Vis02]. He also showed in [Vis02] that those variant of axioms of H_σ are sound for Σ_1 arithmetical interpretations in HA.

Map of sections

Let us explain the content of sections and their interrelationship. All of the contents of this paper are minimally chosen for one major goal: "The completeness of H_σ for arithmetical Σ_1-substitutions, i.e. Theorem 6.4". In section 2, we give definitions of some elementary notions and also make some conventions. In section 3, we gather all the required statements with arithmetical nature. Most of the lemmas and definitions are for one purpose: proving a refinement of Leivant's principle in

[1] http://www.mi.ras.ru/~bekl

Lemma 3.18 (or its simplified form in Theorem 3.14). This will be used in section 5. In section 4, we collect all required notions with propositional nature. The most crucial fact we will show in this section is that in H_σ, one could transform any modal proposition to another proposition with simpler form (roughly speaking with no nested implications to the left). Then we show that the theory LC, which consists of $i\mathsf{GL}$ plus the completeness principle and H_σ prove the same TNNIL-propositions. Moreover we show that LC is sound and complete for a special class of finite Kripke models. In section 5, we show that one could transform a finite Kripke model of LC (with tree-frame) to a first-order Kripke-model of HA. This transformation is such that there is a natural correspondence between these two Kripke-models. Finally in section 6, we use the results of section 4 and section 5 to prove the completeness of H_σ for arithmetical Σ_1-substitutions.

For better understanding of what is going on this paper, we propose to those readers who are somehow familiar with intuitionistic arithmetic and intuitionistic modal logics, have a look at first Example 6.1 and Example 6.2 at the beginning of the section 6.

2 Definitions and conventions

The propositional non-modal language, $\mathcal{L}_0$ contains atomic variables, $\vee, \wedge, \to, \bot$ and the propositional modal language, $\mathcal{L}_\Box$ has an additional operator $\Box$. In this paper, the atomic propositions (in modal or non-modal language) includes atomic variables and $\bot$. For an arbitrary proposition A, $\mathsf{Sub}(A)$ is defined to be the set of all sub-formulae of A, including A itself. We take $\mathsf{Sub}(X) := \bigcup_{A\in X} \mathsf{Sub}(A)$ for a set of propositions X. We use $\boxdot A$ as a shorthand for $A \wedge \Box A$. The logic IPC is intuitionistic propositional non-modal logic over usual propositional non-modal language. The theory $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box$ is the same theory IPC in the extended language of propositional modal language, i.e. its language is propositional modal language and its axioms and rules are the same as the one in IPC . Because we have no axioms for $\Box$ in $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box$, it is obvious that $\Box A$ for each A, behaves exactly like an atomic variable inside $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box$. First-order intuitionistic logic is denoted IQC and the logic CQC is its classical closure, i.e. IQC plus the principle of excluded middle. For a set of sentences and rules $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$ in the propositional non-modal, propositional modal or first-order language, $\Gamma \vdash A$ means that A is derivable from Γ in the system $\mathsf{IPC}, \mathsf{IPC}_\Box, \mathsf{IQC}$, respectively. For an arithmetical formula A, $\ulcorner A \urcorner$ represents the Gödel number of A. For an arbitrary arithmetical theory T with a set of Δ_0-axioms, we have the Δ_0-predicate $\mathsf{Proof}_T(x, \ulcorner A \urcorner)$, that is a formalization of "x is code of a proof for A in T". We also have the provability predicate $\mathsf{Prov}_T(\ulcorner A \urcorner) := \exists x\ \mathsf{Proof}_T(x, \ulcorner A \urcorner)$. The set of natural numbers is denoted by $\omega := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$.

Definition 2.1. *Suppose T is an recursively enumerable (r.e.) arithmetical theory and σ is a function from atomic variables to arithmetical sentences. We extend σ to all modal propositions A, inductively:*

- $\sigma_T(A) := \sigma(A)$ *for atomic A,*
- σ_T *distributes over $\wedge, \vee, \to$,*
- $\sigma_T(\Box A) := \mathsf{Prov}_T(\ulcorner \sigma_T(A) \urcorner)$.

We call σ a Σ_1-substitution, if for every atomic A, $\sigma(A)$ is a Σ_1-formula.

Definition 2.2. *The provability logic of a sufficiently strong theory, T is defined to be a modal propositional theory $\mathcal{PL}(T)$ such that $\mathcal{PL}(T) \vdash A$ iff for all arithmetical substitutions σ, $T \vdash \sigma_T(A)$. If we restrict the substitutions to Σ_1-substitutions, then the new modal theory is $\mathcal{PL}_\sigma(T)$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be a non-modal proposition with $p_i \neq p_j$ for all $0 < i < j \leq n$. Then for all modal sentences $B_1, \ldots, B_n$ with $B_i \neq B_j$ for $0 < i < j \leq n$ we have:*

$$\mathsf{IPC} \vdash A \quad \textit{iff} \quad \mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A[p_1|\Box B_1, \ldots, p_n|\Box B_n]$$

Proof. By simple inductions on complexity of proofs in IPC and $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box$. ❑

We define NOI (No Outside Implication) as the set of modal propositions A, such that any occurrence of $\to$ is in the scope of some $\Box$. To be able to state an extension of Leivant's Principle (that is adequate to axiomatize Σ_1-provability logic of HA) we need a translation on the modal language which we name *Leivant's translation*. We define it recursively as follows:

- $A^l := A$ for atomic or boxed A,
- $(A \wedge B)^l := A^l \wedge B^l$.
- $(A \vee B)^l := \boxdot A^l \vee \boxdot B^l$.
- $(A \to B)^l$ is defined by cases: If $A \in \mathsf{NOI}$, we define $(A \to B)^l := A \to B^l$, otherwise we define $(A \to B)^l := A \to B$.

Definition 2.4. *Minimal provability logic* iGL*, is same as Gödel-Löb provability logic* GL *, without the principle of excluded middle, i.e. it has the following axioms and rules:*

- *The theorems of* $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box$.
- $\Box(A \to B) \to (\Box A \to \Box B)$,
- $\Box A \to \Box\Box A$,
- *Löb's axiom* (L)*:* $\Box(\Box A \to A) \to \Box A$,
- *Necessitation Rule:* $A/\Box A$,
- *Modus ponens:* $(A, A \to B)/B$.

$\mathsf{iK4}$ *is* iGL *without Löb's axiom. Note that we can get rid of the necessitation rule by adding* $\Box A$ *to the axioms, for each axiom* A *in the above list. We will use this fact later in this paper. We list the following axiom schemas:*

- *the Completeness Principle:* $\mathsf{CP} := A \to \Box A$.
- *Restricted Completeness Principle to atomic formulae:* $\mathsf{CP_a} := p \to \Box p$*, for atomic* p.
- *Leivant's Principle:* $\mathsf{Le} := \Box(B \vee C) \to \Box(\Box B \vee C)$. *[Lei75]*
- *Extended Leivant's Principle:* $\mathsf{Le}^+ := \Box A \to \Box A^l$.

We define theories $\mathsf{LC} := \mathsf{iGL} + \mathsf{CP}$ *and* $\mathsf{LLe}^+ := \mathsf{iGL} + \mathsf{Le}^+ + \mathsf{CP_a}$. *Note that in the presence of* CP *and modus ponens, the necessitation rule is superfluous. Later we will find a Kripke semantics for* LC *and also we will see that* LC *and* LLe^+ *proves the same formulae w.r.t. a class of restricted complexity, to wit* TNNIL.

3 Arithmetic

In this section, we gather some preliminaries from intuitionistic arithmetic. Mostly we will prove some refinements of well-known theorems such as: Π_2-conservativity of PA over HA, Gödel's diagnolization lemma and Σ_1-completeness of HA. Most of these preliminaries will be used to prove a refinement of Leivant's principle $\Box(A \vee B) \to \Box(\boxdot A \vee \boxdot B)$ in the technical Lemma 3.17. For better understanding of what Lemma 3.17 is going to state, we suggest the reader first to see Theorem 3.14.

3.1 Some arithmetical preliminaries

The first-order language of arithmetic contains three functions (successor, addition and multiplication), one predicate symbol and a constant: $(S, +, ., <, 0)$. First-order intuitionistic arithmetic (HA) is the theory over IQC with the axioms:

Q1 $\mathsf{S}(x) \neq 0$,

Q2 $\mathsf{S}(x) = \mathsf{S}(y) \to x = y$,

Q3 $y = 0 \vee \exists x\, \mathsf{S}(x) = y$,

Q4 $x + 0 = x$,

Q5 $x + \mathsf{S}(y) = \mathsf{S}(x + y)$,

Q6 $x.0 = 0$,

Q7 $x.\mathsf{S}(y) = (x.y) + x$,

Q8 $x < y \leftrightarrow \exists z(x + \mathsf{S}(z) = y)$,

Ind: For each formula $A(x)$:

$$\mathsf{Ind}(A, x) := \mathcal{UC}[A(0) \wedge \forall x(A(x) \to A(\mathsf{S}(x)))] \to \forall x A(x)]$$

In which $\mathcal{UC}(B)$ is the universal closure of B.

Peano Arithmetic PA, has the same axioms of HA over CQC.

Notation 3.1. *¿From now on, when we are working in first-order language of arithmetic, for a first-order sentence A, $\Box A$ and $\Box^+ A$ are shorthand for $\mathsf{Prov}_{\mathsf{HA}}(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ and $\mathsf{Prov}_{\mathsf{PA}}(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$, respectively. Let $i\Sigma_1$ be the theory HA, where the induction principle is restricted to Σ_1-formulae. We also define the theories HA_x to be the theory with axioms of HA, in which the induction principle is restricted to formulas satisfying one of the following conditions:*

- *formulas of the form $(A \to B) \to B$ in which A and B are Σ_1.*
- *formulas with Gödel number less than x.*

We can define similar concept for PA_x. Note that classically, formulas of the form $(A \to B) \to B$ in which A and B are Σ_1, are equivalent to the Σ_1-formula $A \vee B$ and hence PA_0 is the well-known theory $I\Sigma_1$. We also define $\Box_x A$ and $\Box_x^+ A$ to be $\mathsf{Prov}_{\mathsf{HA}_x}(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$ and $\mathsf{Prov}_{\mathsf{PA}_x}(\ulcorner A \urcorner)$, respectively.

We recall that a function f on $\omega := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is recursive iff there exists some Σ_1-formula $A_f(\bar{x}, y)$ such that $\mathbb{N} \models A_f(\bar{x}, y)$ iff $f(\bar{x}) = y$. It is called to be provably (in T) total, iff $T \vdash \forall \bar{x} \exists y A_f(\bar{x}, y)$.

It is well known that all primitive recursive functions are provably total in $I\Sigma_1$ with a Δ_0-formula as defining formula. So we may use primitive recursive function symbols in the language of arithmetic with their defining axioms (as far as we work in $I\Sigma_1$).

Lemma 3.2. *Let A, B be Σ_1-formulae such that $\mathsf{PA} \vdash A \to B$. Then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash A \to B$.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Π_2-conservativity of PA over HA. [TvD88](3.3.4). ❑

Lemma 3.3. *For any Δ_0-formula $A(\bar{x})$, we have $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \forall \bar{x}(A(\bar{x}) \vee \neg A(\bar{x}))$.*

Proof. This is well-known in the literature. ❑

The Gödel-Gentzen translation associates a formula A^g to any formula A in a first-order language, and is defined inductively by the following items:

- $A^g := A$, for atomic A,
- $(A \wedge B)^g := A^g \wedge B^g$,
- $(A \vee B)^g := \neg(\neg A^g \wedge \neg B^g)$,
- $(A \to B)^g := A^g \to B^g$,
- $(\forall x A)^g := \forall x A^g$,
- $(\exists x A)^g := \neg \forall x \neg A^g$.

The Friedman translation associates a formula A^C, for an arbitrary formula C, to any formula A in a first-order language. Roughly speaking, A^C is the result of adding C as a disjunct to all atomic sub-formulas of A. To define A^C, we assume that free variables of C do not appear as bound variables of A. It is obvious that we can always take care of this detail by renaming bound variables of A to fresh variables.

- $A^C := A \vee C$, for atomic A,
- $(A \wedge B)^C := A^C \wedge B^C$,
- $(A \vee B)^C := A^C \vee B^C$,
- $(A \to B)^C := A^C \to B^C$,
- $(\forall x A)^C := \forall x A^C$,
- $(\exists x A)^C := \exists x A^C$.

As shown in [TvD88], we have the following properties for Gödel-Gentzen and Friedman translations:

- For each Σ_1-formula A in the language of arithmetic, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash A^g \leftrightarrow \neg\neg A$ and $\mathsf{HA} \vdash A^C \leftrightarrow (A \vee C)$.
- For any A in the language of arithmetic, $\mathsf{CQC} \vdash A$ implies $\mathsf{IQC} \vdash A^g$.
- HA_0 is closed under Friedman's translation with respect to Σ_1-formulas. i.e. for any Σ_1-formula B and any A, $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash A$ implies $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash A^B$. Actually in [TvD88], this property is proved for HA instead of HA_0, but this case is very similar to that one.

We have the following variant of Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.4. *For any Σ_1-formula A, $\mathsf{PA}_0 \vdash A$ implies $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash A$. Hence for any Π_2-sentence A, $\mathsf{PA}_0 \vdash A$ implies $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash A$.*

Proof. First observe that $\mathsf{PA}_0 \vdash B$ implies $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash B^g$, by induction on proof of B in PA_0. We refer the reader to [TvD88] for a detailed proof of this fact for PA and HA instead of PA_0 and HA_0. It should only be noted that for any instance B of induction over Σ_1 formulae, by definition and properties of Gödel-Gentzen translation, B^g belongs to the axioms of HA_0, since, for A and B in Σ_1, the formula $(A \to B) \to B$ translates, modulo provable equivalence, to $\neg\neg\,(A \vee B)$. Hence, we have $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \neg\neg A$, and, thus, $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash (\neg\neg A)^A$. This implies $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash A$, as desired. ❑

Consider the mapping:

$$F : n \mapsto A(\mathsf{S}^n(0)) := A(\overbrace{\mathsf{S}\ldots\mathsf{S}}^{n \text{ times}}(0))$$

Let G be the function that assigns to n the Gödel number of $F(n)$. We use $\ulcorner A(\dot{x}) \urcorner$ as a term for G. We may omit the dot over variables when no confusion is likely.

Lemma 3.5. *For every formula $A(x, x_1 \ldots, x_n)$ with free variables exactly as shown, there exists a formula $B(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ such that*

$$\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash B(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leftrightarrow A(\ulcorner B(\dot{x}_1, \ldots, \dot{x}_n) \urcorner, x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

Moreover, if the formula A is Δ_0, then B is also Δ_0.

Proof. It is easy to see that the usual proof of the Fixed Point lemma holds in this setting. ❑

The following lemma, states the Σ_1-completeness of HA_0.

Lemma 3.6. HA_0 *proves all true Σ_1 sentences. Moreover this argument is formalizable and provable in HA_0, i.e. for every Σ_1-formula $A(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ we have $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash A(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \rightarrow \Box_0 A(\dot{x}_1, \ldots, \dot{x}_k)$.*

Proof. It is a well-known fact that any true (in standard model $\mathbb{N}$) Σ_1-sentence is provable in $i\Sigma_1$. Moreover this argument is constructive and formalizable in $i\Sigma_1$. ❑

Lemma 3.7. *For every formula A, we have $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \forall x\ \Box^+(\Box^+_x A \rightarrow A)$ and $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \forall x\ \Box(\Box_x A \rightarrow A)$.*

Proof. The case of PA is well known. For the case HA, see [Smo73b] or Theorem 8.1 in [Vis02]. ❑

Coding of finite sequences

We use some fixed method for encoding of finite sequences and use $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$ as the code of the finite sequence $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. We assume here that the encoding is a one-one correspondence between natural numbers and the assiciated finite sequences. For details on coding of finite sequences, we refer the reader to [Smo85], Chapter 0.

Let $x = \langle x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$ and $y = \langle y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_m \rangle$. The following notations are used in this paper:

- $\mathsf{lth}(x)$ is defined as the length of the sequence with the code x, i.e. here $\mathsf{lth}(x) := n + 1$,
- $x * y := \langle x_0, \ldots, x_n, y_0, \ldots, y_m \rangle$,
- $(x)_i$ is defined (if $i < \mathsf{lth}(x)$) as the i-th element in the sequence with the code x, i.e. here $(x)_i := x_i$. If also $i \geq \mathsf{lth}(x)$, we define $(x)_i := 0$,
- $\hat{x}$ is defined as the final element of the sequence with the code x, i.e. here $\hat{x} := (x)_{\mathsf{lth}(x) \dot{-} 1}$,
- x is an initial segment of y ($x \subseteq_{\mathsf{i}} y$) if $\mathsf{lth}(x) \leq \mathsf{lth}(y)$ and for all $j < \mathsf{lth}(x)$, we have $(x)_j = (y)_j$.

Kripke models of HA

A first-order Kripke model for HA is a triple $\mathcal{K} = (K, <, \mathfrak{M})$ such that:

- The frame of $\mathcal{K}$, i.e. $(K, <)$, is a non-empty partially ordered set,
- $\mathfrak{M}$ is a function from K to the first-order classical structures for the language of the arithmetic, i.e. $\mathfrak{M}(\alpha)$ is a first-order classical structure, for each $\alpha \in K$,
- For any $\alpha \leq \beta \in K$, $\mathfrak{M}(\alpha)$ is an elementary (**weak**) substructure of $\mathfrak{M}(\beta)$.

For any $\alpha \in K$ and first-order formula $A \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$ (the language of arithmetic augmented with constant symbols $\bar{a}$ for each $a \in |\mathfrak{M}(\alpha)|$), we define $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash A$ (or simply $\alpha \Vdash A$, if no confusion is likely) inductively as follows:

- For atomic A, $\alpha \Vdash A$ iff $\mathfrak{M}(\alpha) \models A$. Note that in the structure $\mathfrak{M}(\alpha)$, $\bar{a}$ is interpreted as a,
- If A is conjunction, disjunction or implication, $\alpha \Vdash A$ as in modal propositional case (see subsection 4.5),

- If $A = \forall x B$, $\alpha \Vdash A$ iff for all $\beta \geq \alpha$ and each $b \in |\mathfrak{M}(\beta)|$, we have $\beta \Vdash B[x : \bar{b}]$.

It is well-known in the literature that HA is complete for first-order Kripke models.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{K} = (K, <, \mathfrak{M})$ be a Kripke model of HA and A be an arbitrary Σ_1-formula. Then for each $\alpha \in K$, we have $\alpha \Vdash A$ iff $\mathfrak{M}(\alpha) \models A$.*

Proof. Use induction on the complexity of A to show that for each $\beta \in K$, we have $\beta \Vdash A$ iff $\mathfrak{M}(\beta) \models B$. In the inductive step for $\rightarrow$ and $\forall$, use Lemma 3.3. ❑

3.2 q-Realizability and Leivant's principle

A variant of realizability introduced by Kleene, is q-realizability (see [TvD88]) which is defined inductively for arithmetical formula A as follows:

- $x \ \mathsf{q} \ A := A$ for atomic A.
- $x \ \mathsf{q} \ (A_1 \wedge A_2) := \mathsf{j}_1(x) \ \mathsf{q} \ A_1 \wedge \mathsf{j}_2(x) \ \mathsf{q} \ A_2$,
- $x \ \mathsf{q} \ (A_1 \vee A_2) := (\mathsf{j}_1(x) = 0 \rightarrow \mathsf{j}_2(x) \ \mathsf{q} \ A_1) \wedge (\mathsf{j}_1(x) \neq 0 \rightarrow \mathsf{j}_2(x) \ \mathsf{q} \ A_2)$,
- $x \ \mathsf{q} \ (A_1 \rightarrow A_2) := \forall y \, (y \ \mathsf{q} \ A_1 \rightarrow \exists u \, (\mathsf{T}xyu \wedge \mathsf{U}(u) \ \mathsf{q} \ A_2)) \wedge (A_1 \rightarrow A_2)$,
- $x \ \mathsf{q} \ \exists y A(y) := j_1(x) \ \mathsf{q} \ A(j_2(x))$,
- $x \ \mathsf{q} \ \forall y A(y) := \forall y \, \exists u \, (\mathsf{T}xyu \wedge \mathsf{U}(u) \ \mathsf{q} \ A(y))$

In above definition $\mathsf{j}_1, \mathsf{j}_2$ are inverses for a one-to-one onto, pairing function, j, such that $x = \mathsf{j}(\mathsf{j}_1(x), \mathsf{j}_2(x))$. Also $\mathsf{T}xyu$ is Kleene's predicate formalizing "u is a computation for the Turing Machine with code x with input y", and U is the result extractor function, i.e. if u is a computation for a Turing Machine, then $\mathsf{U}(u)$ is its output.

Lemma 3.9. *For any formula A we have $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash x \ \mathsf{q} \ A \rightarrow A$.*

Proof. See [TvD88]. ❑

In the following, $\{x\}$ is partial recursive function of Turing Machine with code x. The notation $\{x\}y\downarrow$ means that "The function $\{x\}$ is defined on input y", or equivalently "The Turing machine with code x halts with input y". It is well known that $\{x\}y\downarrow$ is a Σ_1 sentence. We use terms which contain some Kleene's bracket notation. In that case, we use $t\downarrow$ to mean that all the brackets in t are defined (terminate).

One immediate consequence of q-realizability, is Church's Rule for HA:

Lemma 3.10. *For every formula $A(x, y)$, if $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \forall x \, \exists y \, A(x, y)$, then there exists some $n \in \omega$ such that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \forall x \, (\{n\}(x) \downarrow \wedge A(x, \{n\}(x)))$.*

Proof. See [TvD88]. ❑

It is easy to observe that "$\mathsf{HA} \vdash A$" implies "there exists some n such that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash n \ \mathsf{q} \ A$"([TvD88]). The point of the following lemma is that we can actually compute this n from the (code of) proof of A in HA and moreover we can formalize this argument in HA:

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose that $A(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is an arithmetical formula with free variables as shown. Then, there exists a provably (in HA) total recursive function f such that:*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x A(\dot{x}_1, \ldots, \dot{x}_m) \rightarrow \exists z \, \Box_{f(x)}(\{\dot{z}\}\langle \dot{x}_1, \ldots, \dot{x}_m \rangle\downarrow \wedge \{\dot{z}\}\langle \dot{x}_1, \ldots, \dot{x}_m \rangle \ \mathsf{q} \ A(\dot{x}_1, \ldots, \dot{x}_m))$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of the soundness part of [TvD88, Theorem 4.10]. First define $f(n)$ in this way:

$$f(n) := \max(\{\ulcorner B^{\mathsf{q},x} \urcorner \mid \ulcorner B \urcorner < n,\ x \text{ is a free variable of } B\} \cup \{n\})$$

in which, $B^{\mathsf{q},x} := \{t(u)\}\langle x\rangle\downarrow \wedge \{t(u)\}\langle x\rangle \ \mathsf{q}\ B$, $u \neq x$ and $t(u)$ is a primitive recursive function that will be defined later in the proof. Let's fix some sequence of numbers $\boldsymbol{m}$. With induction on the complexity of the proof $\mathsf{HA}_n \vdash A(\boldsymbol{m})$, we show that (by $A(\boldsymbol{m})$, we mean $A[\boldsymbol{x} : \boldsymbol{m}]$)

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \text{“}\mathsf{HA}_n \vdash A(\boldsymbol{m})\text{”} \rightarrow \text{“ there exists some number } k \text{ such that } \mathsf{HA}_{f(n)} \vdash k\ \mathsf{q}\ A(\boldsymbol{m})\text{”}$$

We only treat the case that A is an instance of induction schema. All the other cases are trivial and left to reader. Assume that $\ulcorner B \urcorner < n$ and

$$A(\boldsymbol{m}) = (B[x:0] \wedge \forall x(B \rightarrow B[x : S(x)])) \rightarrow \forall x B$$

We should find some k such that $\mathsf{HA}_{f(n)} \vdash k\ \mathsf{q}\ [(B(0) \wedge \forall x(B(x) \rightarrow B(x+1)) \rightarrow \forall x B]$. By definition of q-realizability, we have:

$$k\ \mathsf{q}\ A(\boldsymbol{m}) = \overbrace{\forall u[u\ \mathsf{q}\ (B(0) \wedge \forall x(B(x) \rightarrow B(x+1)) \rightarrow (\{k\}(u)\downarrow \wedge \{k\}(u)\ \mathsf{q}\ \forall x B)]}^{C} \wedge A(\boldsymbol{m})$$

Since $f(n) \geq n$, we have $\mathsf{HA}_{f(n)} \vdash A(\boldsymbol{m})$. Hence it remains only to show that $\mathsf{HA}_{f(n)} \vdash C$. Define the primitive recursive function $t(u)$ in the following way. For any given u, $t(u)$ is the code of the Turing Machine that fulfills the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \{t(u)\}\langle 0\rangle = j_1(u) \\ \{t(u)\}(x+1) = \{\{j_2(u)\}\langle x\rangle\}\langle\{t(u)\}\langle x\rangle\rangle \end{cases}$$

Finally, let k be the code of the Turing Machine that computes the prmitive recursive function t. Now it is not defiicult to observe that, by induction on $B^{\mathsf{q},x}$, one could deduce C in HA_0, and hence $\mathsf{HA}_{f(n)} \vdash C$. This implies $\mathsf{HA}_{f(n)} \vdash A(\boldsymbol{m})$, as desired. ❑

Lemma 3.12. *For every sentence A, there exists some provably (in HA) total recursive function h_A such that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \forall x\, \Box_{h_A(x)}(\Box_{\dot{x}} A \rightarrow A)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.7 we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \forall x\, \exists y\, \Box_y(\Box_{\dot{x}} A \rightarrow A)$. Now we have the desired result by use of Lemma 3.10. ❑

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose that $A(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is a Σ_1-formula with variables as shown. Then there exists some $n_A \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash A(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \rightarrow (\{n_A\}\langle x_1, \ldots, x_m\rangle\downarrow \wedge \{n_A\}\langle x_1, \ldots, x_m\rangle\ \mathsf{q}\ A(x_1, \ldots, x_m))$$

Proof. This theorem for $\mathbf{r}$-realizability instead of q-realizability is proved in [TvD88](Proposition 4.4.5). The proof for $\mathbf{q}$-realizability is quite similar and we leave it to the reader. ❑

It is well-known that the disjunction property holds for IPC and HA, however it is also shown that in case of HA , the proof is not formalizable in HA, i.e. $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \Box(A \vee B) \rightarrow (\Box A \vee \Box B)$. But this is not the end of story! Daniel Leivant in his PhD dissertation [Lei75] showed that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box(A \vee B) \rightarrow \Box(A \vee \Box B)$. Albert Visser in an unpublished paper showed that we can extend Leivant's principle to the following version. For every Σ_1-sentence A, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box(A \rightarrow (B \vee C)) \rightarrow \Box(A \rightarrow (\Box B \vee C))$. In the following lemma, we will show that we can find (constructively) from the code x of the proof of $A \rightarrow (B \vee C)$, some $f(x)$ such that $\Box(A \rightarrow (\Box_{f(x)} B \vee C))$ holds. Although the statement of this theorem would not be used later in this paper, we bring it here for better understanding of its generalization in a more technical lemma, i.e. Lemma 3.17.

Theorem 3.14. *For arbitrary sentences A, B, C such that $A \in \Sigma_1$, there exists a provably (in* HA*) total recursive function f such that*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x(A \to (B \vee C)) \to \Box_{f(x)}(A \to (\Box_{f(x)}B \vee C))$$

Proof. First observe that, by Lemma 3.13, there exists some finite number $n_A \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash A \to (\{n_A\}\langle\rangle\downarrow \wedge \{n_A\}\langle\rangle \ \mathsf{q}\ A)$. We set $t_0 := \{n_A\}\langle\rangle$. Hence there exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_{n_0}(A \to (t_0\downarrow \wedge t_0 \ \mathsf{q}\ A)) \tag{1}$$

We work inside HA. Assume $\Box_x(A \to (B \vee C))$. By Lemma 3.11, there exists some z such that $\Box_{g_0(x)}(\{\dot{z}\}\langle\rangle \downarrow \wedge \{\dot{z}\}\langle\rangle \ \mathsf{q}\ (A \to (B \vee C)))$, in which g_0 is the recursive function provided by Lemma 3.11. We define $t_1 := \{\dot{z}\}\langle\rangle$ and hence we have $\Box_{g_0(x)}t_1\downarrow$. If we set $g_1(y) := g_0(y) + n_0$, by use of Equation 1, we can deduce $\Box_{g_1(x)}(A \to (t_0\downarrow \wedge \{t_1\}(t_0) \ \mathsf{q}\ (B \vee C)))$. We set $t_2 := \{t_1\}(t_0)$. Then, by definition of q-realizability, we have:

$$\Box_{g_1(x)}(A \to (t_2\downarrow \wedge (j_1(t_2) = 0 \to j_2(t_2) \ \mathsf{q}\ B) \wedge (j_1(t_2) \neq 0 \to j_2(t_2) \ \mathsf{q}\ C))).$$

Let $B' := (j_1(t_2) = 0) \to j_2(t_2) \ \mathsf{q}\ B$ and $C' := (j_1(t_2) \neq 0) \to j_2(t_2) \ \mathsf{q}\ C$ Then we have $\Box_{g_1(x)}(A \to B')$ and, hence, by Σ_1-completeness (Lemma 3.6), we can deduce $\Box_0\Box_{g_1(x)}(A \to B')$, that again by use of Lemma 3.6, implies $\Box_0(A \to \Box_{g_1(x)}B')$. Thus we have

$$\Box_{g_1(x)}(A \to (t_2\downarrow \wedge \Box_{g_1(x)}B' \wedge C'))$$

Again by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.9, $\Box_{g_1(x)}(A \to (t_2\downarrow \wedge (j_1(t_2) = 0 \to \Box_{g_1(x)}B) \wedge (j_1(t_2) \neq 0 \to C)))$. Since atomic formulae are decidable in HA, so for any atomic formulae D, there exists some finite n_2 such that in HA_{n_2} we have decidability of D. Let $\mathsf{HA}_{n_2} + t_2\downarrow$ decide $j_1(t_2) = 0$. If we set $f(x) := g_1(x) + n_2$, we can deduce $\Box_{f(x)}(A \to (\Box_{f(x)}B \vee C))$, as desired. ❑

3.3 The extended Leivant's Principle

In this section, we study properties of the extended Leivant's principle, Le^+. We prove that for any Σ_1- substitution σ, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(\mathsf{LLe}^+)$.

Define a translation $q_\sigma(A, x)$ recursively for a modal proposition A and a Σ_1-substitution σ, as follows:

- $q_\sigma(A, x) := \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$, if A is atomic or boxed,
- $q_\sigma(A \wedge B, x) := q_\sigma(A, j_1(x)) \wedge q_\sigma(B, j_2(x))$,
- $q_\sigma(A \vee B, x) := (j_1(x) = 0 \to q_\sigma(A, j_2(x))) \wedge (j_1(x) \neq 0 \to q_\sigma(B, j_2(x)))$,
- if $A = B \to C$ and $B \in \mathsf{NOI}$, we define $q_\sigma(B \to C, x) := \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(B) \to (\{x\}(n_B)\downarrow \wedge q_\sigma(C, \{x\}(n_B)))$, in which n_B is as in Lemma 3.13. If $B \notin \mathsf{NOI}$, then define $q_\sigma(A, x) := \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$.

Lemma 3.15. *Let A be a modal proposition and t be a term in first-order language of arithmetic which possibly contain Kleene's brackets. Then*

- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash x \ \mathsf{q}\ \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A) \to q_\sigma(A, x)$,
- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash (t\downarrow \wedge q_\sigma(A, t)) \to \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$,

Proof. Proof of both parts are by induction on the complexity of A. ❑

For the next lemma, we need some auxiliary notation $\sigma_{l}(A, x)$. Informally speaking, $\sigma_{l}(A, x)$ is going to be $\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^l)$ with one difference. The new added boxes in A^l should be interpreted as provability in HA_x. More precisely, we define it inductively as the following.

- A is atomic or boxed. $\sigma_{\iota}(A,x) := \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$,
- $A = B \wedge C$. then $\sigma_{\iota}(A,x) := \sigma_{\iota}(B,x) \wedge \sigma_{\iota}(C,x)$,
- $A = B \vee C$. then $\sigma_{\iota}(A,x) := \boxdot_x \sigma_{\iota}(B,x) \vee \boxdot_x \sigma_{\iota}(C,x)$, in which $\boxdot_x D$ is defined as $D \wedge \Box_x D$,
- $A = B \to C$. Like the definition of A^l, we define $\sigma_{\iota}(A,x)$ by cases. If $A \in \mathsf{NOI}$, then we define $\sigma_{\iota}(A,x) := \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(B) \to \sigma_{\iota}(C,x)$, otherwise we define $\sigma_{\iota}(A,x) := \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$.

Lemma 3.16. *Let A be a modal proposition. Then*

- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash (x \leq y \wedge \sigma_{\iota}(A,x)) \to \sigma_{\iota}(A,y)$,
- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \sigma_{\iota}(A,x) \to \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^l)$,
- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \sigma_{\iota}(A,x) \to \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$.

Proof. Use induction on A. ❑

Lemma 3.17. *Let A be a modal proposition, D be any Σ_1-sentence and t be a term in first-order language of arithmetic which possibly contain Kleene's brackets. Then there exists a provably total recursive function f such that*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x(D \to (t{\downarrow} \wedge q_\sigma(A,t)) \to \Box_{f(x)}(D \to \sigma_{\iota}(A, f(x)))$$

Proof. We use induction on A. For simplicity of notations, we assume here that t is a normal term. One can build the general case easily.

Atomic, Boxed or conjunction: Trivial.

Disjunction. Let $A = B \vee C$. Then by definition of q_σ, we have

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x(D \to q_\sigma(B \vee C,t)) \to [\Box_x((D \wedge j_1(t) = 0) \to q_\sigma(B, j_2(t))) \wedge \Box_x((D \wedge j_1(t) \neq 0) \to q_\sigma(C, j_2(t))]$$

Hence by the induction hypothesis, there exists functions g and h such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{HA} \vdash & \Box_x(D \to q_\sigma(B \vee C,t)) \to \\ & \Box_{g(x)}((D \wedge j_1(t) = 0) \to \sigma_{\iota}(B, g(x))) \wedge \Box_{h(x)}((D \wedge j_1(t) \neq 0) \to \sigma_{\iota}(C, h(x)))\end{aligned}$$

Let $f(x)$ be the maximum of $g(x)$ and $h(x)$. Finally, one can use Σ_1-completeness of HA_0 (Lemma 3.6) and Lemma 3.16 to derive

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x(D \to q_\sigma(B \vee C,t)) \to \Box_{f(x)}(D \to (\boxdot_{f(x)} \sigma_{\iota}(B, f(x)) \vee \boxdot_{f(x)} \sigma_{\iota}(C, f(x))))$$

Implication. Assume that $A = B \to C$. If $B \notin \mathsf{NOI}$, by Lemma 3.15, we are done. So assume that $B \in \mathsf{NOI}$. By definition of q_σ, there exists some term t_1 such that

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x[D \to q_\sigma(B \to C,t)] \to \Box_x[(D \wedge \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(B)) \to (t_1{\downarrow} \wedge q_\sigma(C, t_1))]$$

Since $B \in \mathsf{NOI}$, $\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(B)$ is a Σ_1-formula. Hence by the induction hypothesis, there exists some function f such that

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x(D \to q_\sigma(A,t)) \to \Box_{f(x)}((D \wedge \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(B)) \to \sigma_{\iota}(C, f(x)))$$

This by definition of $\sigma_{\iota}(B \to C, f(x))$, implies the desired result. ❑

Lemma 3.18. *For any Σ_1-substitution σ and modal proposition A, there exists some provably total recursive function g such that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A) \to \Box_{g(x)} \sigma_{\iota}(A, g(x))$.*

Proof. Work inside HA. Assume $\Box_x \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$. By Lemma 3.11, there exists some y such that

$$\Box_{f_0(x)}(t{\downarrow} \wedge t \mathbin{\mathsf{q}} \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A))$$

in which $t := \{y\}\langle\rangle$ and f_0 is a provably total recursive function as stated in Lemma 3.11. Hence by the first item of Lemma 3.15, $\Box_{f_0(x)}(t{\downarrow} \wedge q_\sigma(A,t))$. Hence by Lemma 3.17, we have the function f such that $\Box_{f(f_0(x))}\sigma_l(A, f(f_0(x)))$. ❑

Theorem 3.19. *For any Σ_1-substitution σ, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(\mathsf{Le}^+)$.*

Proof. Let A be a modal proposition. We must show $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A) \to \Box\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^l)$. Now the desired result may be deduced by Lemma 3.18 and the second item of Lemma 3.16. ❑

Although there are other ways of proving the above theorem (see [Vis02] or [Iem01]), we need its major preliminary lemma (i.e. Lemma 3.18) in the proof of the completeness theorem. Specially, we use Lemma 3.18 in the proof of Lemma 5.11.

3.4 Interpretability

Let T and S be two first-order theories. Informally speaking, we say that T interprets S ($T \rhd S$) if there exists a translation from the language of S to the language of T such that T proves the translation of all of the theorems of S. For a formal definition see [Vis98]. It is well-known that for recursive theories T, S containing PA, the assertion $T \rhd S$ is formalizable in first-order language of arithmetic. For two arithmetical sentence A, B, we use the notation $A \rhd B$ to mean that $\mathsf{PA} + A$ interprets $\mathsf{PA} + B$. The following theorem due to Orey, first appeared in [Fef60].

Theorem 3.20. *For recursive theories T and S containing PA, we have:*

$$\mathsf{PA} \vdash (T \rhd S) \leftrightarrow \forall x \, \Box_T \mathsf{Con}(S^x),$$

in which S^x is the restriction of the theory S to axioms with Gödel number $\leq x$ and $\mathsf{Con}(U) := \neg\Box_U\bot$.

Proof. See [Fef60]. p.80 or [Ber90]. ❑

Convention. ¿From above theorem, one can easily observe that $\mathsf{PA} \vdash (A \rhd B) \leftrightarrow \forall x \, \Box^+(A \to \neg\Box^+_x\neg B)$. So from now on, $A \rhd B$ means its Π_2-equivalent $\forall x \, \Box^+(A \to \neg\Box^+_x\neg B)$, even when we are working in weaker theories like HA. We remind the reader that $\Box^+$ stands for provability in PA.

4 Propositional modal logics

In this section, we collect all the required notions with propositional flavour. This section is mostly devoted to provide an axiomatic system for the Σ_1-provability logic of HA, i.e. H_σ, and stating some of its essential properties that we need them later in the proof of soundness (Theorem 6.3) or completeness (Theorem 6.4) of H_σ for arithmetical Σ_1-substitutions. The following are some of important results that will be used in the proof of completeness theorem.

- In subsection 4.3, it is shown that the axiomatic system H_σ is capable of simplifying any modal proposition to an equivalent TNNIL^- proposition (Corollary 4.18). This fact is useful for proof of the completeness theorem (Theorem 6.4).
- In subsection 4.4, the TNNIL-conservativity of a stronger theory LC over H_σ (Theorem 4.23) is proved. This conservativity plays an important role in the proof of completeness theorem. As far as working with TNNIL-formulas, we get rid of all those complicated axioms of H_σ and just use the more handful theory LC.

- In subsection 4.5, we will prove the finite model property for the theory LC (Theorem 4.25). With the aid of our main theorem in next section (Theorem 5.1), such finite counter-models are used to be transformed to a first-order counter-models of HA.

4.1 The NNIL formulae and related topics

The class of *No Nested Implications to the Left*, NNIL formulae in a propositional language was introduced in [VvBdJRdL95], and more explored in [Vis02]. The crucial result of [Vis02] is providing an algorithm that as input, receives a non-modal proposition A and returns its best NNIL approximation A^* from below, i.e., $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash A^* \to A$ and for all NNIL formula B such that $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash B \to A$, we have $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash B \to A^*$. Also for all Σ_1-substitutions σ, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(\Box A \leftrightarrow \Box A^*)$ [Vis02].

- In subsubsection 4.1.1, we state Visser's NNIL-algorithm for computing A^*, and some of its useful properties.
- In subsubsection 4.1.2, we explain the extension of this algorithm to the modal language (the TNNIL-algorithm), which computes A^+ and is essentially the same as the NNIL-algorithm with this extra rule: treat inside $\Box$ as a fresh proposition, i.o.w. in the inductive definition of the algorithm $(\Box A)^+ := \Box A^+$. Then we prove some useful properties of TNNIL-algorithm: Lemma 4.6 and Corollary 4.7. The best feature of TNNIL-algorithm is that for all Σ_1-substitutions σ, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(\Box A \leftrightarrow \Box A^+)$ (first part of Corollary 4.7).
- In subsubsection 4.1.3, we define another algorithm TNNIL$^-$ for computing A^-, which is essentially the same as the TNNIL-algorithm, with this minor difference: Only treat those sub-formulae which are boxed and leave the others. With this minor change, we even have a better feature for A^-, i.e., for all Σ_1-substitutions σ, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A \leftrightarrow A^-)$ (Lemma 4.9).

Now we define the class NNIL of modal propositions precisely by $\mathsf{NNIL} := \{A \mid \rho A \leq 1\}$, in which the complexity measure ρ, is defined inductively as follows:

- $\rho(\Box A) = \rho(p) = \rho(\bot) = \rho(\top) = 0$, for an arbitrary atomic variables p and modal proposition A,
- $\rho(A \wedge B) = \rho(A \vee B) = \max(\rho A, \rho B)$,
- $\rho(A \to B) = \max(\rho A + 1, \rho B)$,

In the following, we define an special complexity measure $\mathfrak{o}(.)$ on modal propositions. We need this measure for termination of the NNIL-algorithm.

Definition 4.1. *Let D be a modal proposition. Let*

- $I(D) := \{E \in \mathsf{Sub}(D) \mid E$ *is an implication that is not in the scope of a* $\Box\}$.
- $\mathfrak{i}(D) := max\{|I(E)| \mid E \in I(D)\}$, *where* $|X|$ *is the number of elements of* X.
- $\mathfrak{c}D :=$ *the number of occurrences of logical connectives which are not in the scope of a* $\Box$.
- $\mathfrak{d}D :=$ *the maximum number of nested boxes. To be more precise,*
  - $\mathfrak{d}D := 0$ *for atomic* D,
  - $\mathfrak{d}D := max\{\mathfrak{d}D_1, \mathfrak{d}D_2\}$, *where* $D = D_1 \circ D_2$ *and* $\circ \in \{\wedge, \vee, \to\}$,
  - $\mathfrak{d}\Box D := \mathfrak{d}D + 1$,
- $\mathfrak{o}D := (\mathfrak{d}D, \mathfrak{i}D, \mathfrak{c}D)$.

We order the measures $\mathfrak{o}D$ lexicographically, i.e., $(d, i, c) < (d', i', c')$ iff $d < d'$ or $d = d', i < i'$ or $d = d', i = i', c < c'$.

For the definition of NNIL-algorithm, we use the bracket notation $[A]B$ of [Vis02]. We also use a variant of this notation, $[A]'B$, which implicitly were used in [Vis02]:

Definition 4.2. *For any two modal propositions A and B, we define $[A]B$ and $[A]'B$ by induction on the complexity of B:*

- $[A]B = [A]'B = B$, *for atomic or boxed B,*
- $[A](B_1 \circ B_2) = [A](B_1) \circ [A](B_2)$, $[A]'(B_1 \circ B_2) = [A]'(B_1) \circ [A]'(B_2)$ *for* $\circ \in \{\vee, \wedge\}$,
- $[A](B_1 \to B_2) = A \to (B_1 \to B_2)$, $[A]'(B_1 \to B_2) = (A' \wedge B_1) \to B_2$, *in which* $A' = A[B_1 \to B_2 \mid B_2]$, *i.e., replace each occurrence of $B_1 \to B_2$ in A by B_2,*

4.1.1 The NNIL-algorithm

For each modal proposition A, the proposition A^* is produced by induction on complexity measure $\mathfrak{o}A$ as follows: [Vis02]

1. A is atomic or boxed, take $A^* := A$.
2. $A = B \wedge C$, take $A^* := B^* \wedge C^*$.
3. $A = B \vee C$, take $A^* := B^* \vee C^*$.
4. $A = B \to C$, we have several sub-cases. In the following, an occurrence of E in D is called an *outer occurrence*, if E is neither in the scope of an implication nor in the scope of a boxed formula.
   (a) C contains an outer occurrence of a conjunction. In this case, there is some formula $J(q)$ such that
   - q is a propositional variable not occurring in A.
   - q is outer in J and occurs exactly once.
   - $C = J[q|(D \wedge E)]$.

   Now set $C_1 := J[q|D], C_2 := J[q|E]$ and $A_1 := B \to C_1, A_2 := B \to C_2$ and finally, define $A^* := A_1^* \wedge A_2^*$.
   (b) B contains an outer occurrence of a disjunction. In this case, there is some formula $J(q)$ such that
   - q is a propositional variable not occurring in A.
   - q is outer in J and occurs exactly once.
   - $B = J[q|(D \vee E)]$.

   Now set $B_1 := J[q|D], B_2 := J[q|E]$ and $A_1 := B_1 \to C, A_2 := B_2 \to C$ and finally, define $A^* := A_1^* \wedge A_2^*$.
   (c) $B = \bigwedge X$ and $C = \bigvee Y$ and X, Y are sets of implications or atoms. We have several sub-cases:
   i. X contains atomic variables or boxed formula B. We set $D := \bigwedge(X \setminus \{B\})$ and take $A^* := p^* \to (D \to C)^*$.
   ii. X contains $\top$. Define $D := \bigwedge(X \setminus \{\top\})$ and take $A^* := (D \to C)^*$.
   iii. X contains $\bot$. Take $A^* := \top$.

iv. X contains only implications. For any $D = E \to F \in X$, let

$$B \downarrow D := \bigwedge((X \setminus \{D\}) \cup \{F\}).$$

Let $Z := \{E \mid E \to F \in X\} \cup \{C\}$ and $A_0 := [B]Z := \bigvee\{[B]E \mid E \in Z\}$. Now if $\mathfrak{o}A_0 < \mathfrak{o}A$, we take

$$A^* := \bigwedge\{((B \downarrow D) \to C)^* | D \in X\} \wedge A_0^*,$$

otherwise, first set $A_1 := [B]'Z$ and then take

$$A^* := \bigwedge\{((B \downarrow D) \to C)^* | D \in X\} \wedge A_1^*$$

Remark 4.3. In fact in [Vis02], the NNIL-algorithm is only for non-modal propositions. But one could compute the best NNIL-approximation for modal propositions, with the original algorithm of [Vis02] in the following way. Let A be a given modal proposition. Let $B_1, \ldots, B_n$ be all boxed sub-formulae of A which are not in the scope of any other boxes. Let $A'(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be the unique non-modal proposition such that $\{p_i\}_{1 \le i \le n}$ are fresh atomic variables not occurring in A and $A = A'[p_1|B_1, \ldots, p_n|B_n]$. Let $\gamma(A) := (A')^*[p_1|B_1, \ldots, p_n|B_n]$. Then it is easy to observe that $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash \gamma(A) \leftrightarrow A^*$.

The above defined algorithm is not deterministic, however by the following theorem we know that A^* is unique up to $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box$ equivalence. Notation $A \rhd_{\mathsf{IPC}_\Box, \mathsf{NNIL}} B$ (A, NNIL-preserves B) from [Vis02], means that for each NNIL modal proposition C, if $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash C \to A$, then $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash C \to B$, in which A, B are modal propositions.

Theorem 4.4. *For each modal proposition A,*

1. NNIL *algorithm with input A terminates and the output formula A^*, is an* NNIL *proposition such that* $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^* \to A$.
2. $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^* \to B$ *iff* $A \rhd_{\mathsf{IPC}_\Box, \mathsf{NNIL}} B$.
3. A^* *is the best* NNIL *approximation of A from below i.e.* $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^* \to A$ *and for each* NNIL *proposition B, with* $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash B \to A$, *we have* $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash B \to A^*$.
4. $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1 \to A_2$ *implies* $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1^* \to A_2^*$.
5. $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A \leftrightarrow B$ *implies* $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^* \leftrightarrow B^*$.
6. *For each Σ_1-substitution σ,* $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A) \leftrightarrow \Box\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^*)$.

Proof. 1. Direct consequence of [Vis02, Theorem 7.1]. First assume $A'[p_1, \ldots, p_n]$ be as in Remark 4.3. By [Vis02, Theorem 7.1], we have $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash (A')^* \to A'$, and hence by Lemma 2.3, $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (A')^*[p_1|B_1, \ldots, p_n|B_n] \to A$.

2. Direct consequence of [Vis02, Thorem. 7.2]. First suppose that $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^* \to B$. Let A', B' be non-modal propositions as defined in Remark 4.3, i.e, $A = A'[p_1|C_1, \ldots, p_n|C_n], B = B'[p_1|C_1, \ldots, p_n|C_n]$. Then by Lemma 2.3, $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash (A')^* \to B'$. Now by [Vis02, Theorem 7.2], we have $A' \rhd_{\mathsf{IPC},\mathsf{NNIL}} B'$, and then by Lemma 2.3, $A \rhd_{\mathsf{IPC}_\Box,\mathsf{NNIL}} B$.

3. Suppose $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash B \to A$ and B is NNIL. Since $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^* \to A^*$, from part 2 above, we get $A \rhd_{\mathsf{IPC}_\Box,\mathsf{NNIL}} A^*$. By $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash B \to A$ and $B \in \mathsf{NNIL}$, we have $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash B \to A^*$.

4. Suppose that $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1 \to A_2$. By part 1, $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1^* \to A_2$ and hence by part 3, $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1^* \to A_2^*$.

5. Direct consequence of part 4.

6. First suppose that A is a non-modal proposition. Combining Theorem 10.2 and Corollary 7.2 from [Vis02], implies that $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash A^* \to B$ iff $A \mathrel{|\!\sim}^{\mathsf{HA}}_{\mathsf{HA},\Sigma} B$, in which $A \mathrel{|\!\sim}^{\mathsf{HA}}_{\mathsf{HA},\Sigma} B$ means that for each Σ_1-substitution σ, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box\sigma(A) \to \Box\sigma(B)$. This implies that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box(\sigma(A)) \leftrightarrow \Box\sigma(A^*)$. Now for a modal proposition A, suppose that $A'(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_n$ be such that $A = A'[p_1|B_1, \ldots, p_n|B_n]$ in which A' is a non-modal proposition and $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ are fresh atomic variables (not occurred in A). Let σ' be the substitution defined by $\sigma'(p_i) := \sigma(B_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, and for any other atomic variable q, $\sigma'(q) = \sigma(q)$. Clearly, σ' is again a Σ_1-substitution and hence we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box(\sigma'(A')) \leftrightarrow \Box\sigma'((A')^*)$. This implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box(\sigma(A)) \leftrightarrow \Box\sigma(A^*)$.

❑

4.1.2 The TNNIL-algorithm

Definition 4.5. TNNIL *(Thoroughly* NNIL*) is the smallest class of propositions such that*

- TNNIL *contains all atomic propositions,*
- *if* $A, B \in$ TNNIL*, then* $A \vee B, A \wedge B, \Box A \in$ TNNIL*,*
- *if all* $\to$ *occurring in* A *are contained in the scope of a* $\Box$ *(or equivalently* $A \in$ NOI*) and* $A, B \in$ TNNIL*, then* $A \to B \in$ TNNIL*.*

Finally we define TNNIL^- *as the set of all the propositions like* $A(\Box B_1, \ldots, \Box B_n)$*, such that* $A(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ *is an arbitrary non-modal proposition and* $B_1, \ldots, B_n \in$ TNNIL*.*

Here we define A^+ as TNNIL-formula approximating A. The major difference between A^+ and A^* is that $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^+ \to A$ may not hold any more. Informally speaking, to find A^+, we first compute A^* and then replace all outer boxed formula $\Box B$ in A by $\Box B^+$. To be more accurate, we define A^+ by induction on $\mathfrak{d}A$. Suppose that for all B with $\mathfrak{d}B < \mathfrak{d}A$, we have defined B^+. Suppose that $A'(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ and $\Box B_1, \ldots, \Box B_n$ such that $A = A'[p_1|\Box B_1, \ldots, p_n|\Box B_n]$ where A' is a non-modal proposition and $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ are fresh atomic variables (not occurred in A). It is clear that $\mathfrak{d}B_i < \mathfrak{d}A$ and then we can define $A^+ := (A')^*[p_1|\Box B_1^+, \ldots, p_n|\Box B_n^+]$.

Lemma 4.6. *For every modal proposition* B*,*

- *If* $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash B$ *then* $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash B^+$*.*
- *If* $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash B$ *then* $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash B^+$*.*

Proof. We prove first part by induction on complexity of proof $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash B$. Proof of the second part is similar to the first one.

- B is an axiom.
  - B is Löb's axiom, i.e., $B = \Box(\Box C \to C) \to \Box C$. Then $B^+ = \Box(\Box C^+ \to C^+) \to \Box C^+$, that is valid also in iGL.
  - $B = \Box C \to \Box\Box C$. Then $B^+ = \Box C^+ \to \Box\Box C^+$, that is valid in iGL.
  - $B = (\Box(C \to D) \wedge \Box C) \to \Box D$. Then $B^+ = (\Box(C \to D)^+ \wedge \Box C^+) \to \Box D^+$. On the other hand, $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (C \wedge (C \to D)) \to D$ and hence $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (C \wedge (C \to D))^* \to D^*$, by Theorem 4.4(4). Now we can infer $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (C^+ \wedge (C \to D)^+) \to D^+$, by definition of TNNIL-algorithm and Lemma 2.3. Finally, by the necessitation rule in iGL, we have $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash (\Box C^+ \wedge \Box(C \to D)^+) \to \Box D^+$.
- B is a theorem of $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box$. Then $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash B^+$, by Theorem 4.4(5) and Lemma 2.3.

- $B = \Box C$ and B is derived by applying the necessitation rule. Let $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash C$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash C^+$ and then $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash \Box C^+$.
- B is derived by modus ponens. Let $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A$ and $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A \to B$. ¿From these, we have $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A^+ \wedge (A \to B)^+$ and then $(A \wedge (A \to B))^+$ inside iGL. Since $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (A \wedge (A \to B)) \to B$, then $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (A \wedge (A \to B))^* \to B^*$. Then by Lemma 2.3, $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (A \wedge (A \to B))^+ \to B^+$ and hence $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash B^+$ as desired.

❑

Corollary 4.7. *For any modal proposition A,*

1. *for all Σ_1-substitution σ we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A) \leftrightarrow \Box\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^+)$ and hence $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$ iff $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^+)$.*
2. *$\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A_1 \to A_2$ implies $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A_1^+ \to A_2^+$, and $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A_1 \to A_2$ implies $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A_1^+ \to A_2^+$.*
3. *$\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2$ implies $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A_1^+ \leftrightarrow A_2^+$, and $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2$ implies $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A_1^+ \leftrightarrow A_2^+$.*

Proof. The first assertion can be deduced simply by induction on $\mathfrak{d}A$ and using Theorem 4.4(6).

To prove the second part, first note that by Theorem 4.4(4), if $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1 \to A_2$, then $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1^* \to A_2^*$. By Lemma 2.3, we can replace each outer occurrence of boxed formulae by arbitrary propositions, in particular, by their TNNIL approximations. Then by definition of A^+, we have $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A_1^+ \to A_2^+$. Now suppose that $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A_1 \to A_2$ ($\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A_1 \to A_2$). This implies $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box + X \vdash A_1 \to A_2$, for some X with $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash X$ ($\mathsf{iK4} \vdash X$). So $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (X \wedge A_1) \to (X \wedge A_2)$. Then $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (X \wedge A_1)^+ \to (X \wedge A_2)^+$, and hence by TNNIL-algorithm, $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash (X^+ \wedge A_1^+) \to (X^+ \wedge A_2^+)$. This implies $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box + X^+ \vdash A_1^+ \to A_2^+$ and by Lemma 4.6, $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A_1^+ \to A_2^+$ ($\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A_1^+ \to A_2^+$).

Proof of the third part is direct consequence of the second part. ❑

4.1.3 The TNNIL^--algorithm

Corollary 4.8. *There exists a TNNIL^--algorithm such that for any modal proposition A, it halts and produces a proposition $A^- \in \mathsf{TNNIL}^-$ such that $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A^+ \to A^-$.*

Proof. Let $A := B(\Box C_1, \ldots, \Box C_n)$, and $B(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is non-modal. Clearly such B exists. Then define $A^- := B(\Box C_1^+, \ldots, \Box C_n^+)$. Now definition of A^+ in Corollary 4.7 implies $A^+ = (A^-)^*$ and hence Theorem 4.4.1 implies that A^- has desired property. ❑

Lemma 4.9. *For each modal proposition A and Σ_1-substitution σ, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}} A \leftrightarrow \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}} A^-$.*

Proof. Use definition of $(.)^-$ and Corollary 4.7.1. ❑

Remark 4.10. Note that $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A \leftrightarrow B$ does not imply $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A^+ \leftrightarrow B^+$. A counterexample is $A := \neg\neg p$ and $B := \neg\boxdot(\neg p)$. We have $A^+ = A^* = p$ and $\mathsf{LC} \vdash B^+ \leftrightarrow (\Box\neg p \to p)$. Now one can use Kripke models to show $\mathsf{LC} \nvdash \neg\neg p \to (\Box\neg p \to p)$.

Remark 4.11. In the algorithm produced for NNIL, Let's change step (1) in this way (and use new symbol $(.)^\dagger$ instead of $(.)^*$)

1. $A^\dagger := A$, for atomic A and $(\Box B)^\dagger := \Box B^\dagger$,

Then the new algorithm also halts, and for any modal proposition A, we have $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A^\dagger \leftrightarrow A^+$.

4.2 The Box Translation

The following definition of the box-translation, is essentially from ([Vis82, Def.4.1]). The box-translation extends the well-known Gödel-McKinsey-Tarski translation. In this subsection, we prove that iGL is closed under box-translation (Proposition 4.16).

Definition 4.12. *For every proposition A in the modal propositional language, we associate a proposition $A^{\Box}$, called the box-translation of A, defined inductively as follows:*

- $A^{\Box} := A \wedge \Box A$, *for atomic* A,
- $(A \circ B)^{\Box} := A^{\Box} \circ B^{\Box}$, *for* $\circ \in \{\vee, \wedge\}$,
- $(A \to B)^{\Box} := (A^{\Box} \to B^{\Box}) \wedge \Box(A^{\Box} \to B^{\Box})$,
- $(\Box A)^{\Box} := \Box(A^{\Box})$.

Lemma 4.13. *For any modal proposition A, we have* $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A^{\Box} \to \Box A^{\Box}$.

Proof. Easy induction over the complexity of A. ❑

In the following lemma we state some properties of $\boxdot$.

Lemma 4.14. *For each modal sentences A, B and C, the following propositions are provable in* iK4.

1. $\Box \boxdot A \leftrightarrow \Box A \leftrightarrow \boxdot \Box A$.
2. $\boxdot A^{\Box} \leftrightarrow A^{\Box}$.

Proof. The first part is easily deduced in iK4. For the second one deduce from Lemma 4.13. ❑

Following Visser's definition of the notion of a *base* in arithmetical theories [Vis82], we define

Definition 4.15. *We say that a modal theory T is* closed under box-translation *if for every proposition A, $T \vdash A$ implies $T \vdash A^{\Box}$.*

Proposition 4.16. *The theory* iGL *is closed under box-translation.*

Proof. The proof can be carried out in three steps:

1. For any proposition A first we show that $\mathsf{IPC}_{\Box} \vdash A$ implies $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A^{\Box}$. This can be done by a routine induction on the length of the proof in IPC. Note that for any axiom A of IPC, we have $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A^{\Box}$. As for the rule of modus ponens, suppose that $\mathsf{IPC}_{\Box} \vdash A$ and $\mathsf{IPC}_{\Box} \vdash A \to B$. By induction hypothesis, then $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A^{\Box}$ and $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash (A^{\Box} \to B^{\Box}) \wedge \Box(A^{\Box} \to B^{\Box})$ and so $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash B^{\Box}$.

2. Next observe that
$$(\Box A \to \Box\Box A)^{\Box} = \Box A^{\Box} \to \Box\Box A^{\Box}$$
and also
$$\mathsf{iK4} \vdash [(\Box(A \to B) \wedge \Box A) \to \Box B]^{\Box} \leftrightarrow (\Box(A^{\Box} \to B^{\Box}) \wedge \Box A^{\Box}) \to \Box B^{\Box}$$

3. Observe that the box translation of an instance of Löb's axiom L, is also an instance of L. ❑

4.3 Axiomatizing the TNNIL-algorithm

In this subsection we present axioms which we need for the TNNIL^--algorithm $(.)^-$. More precisely, we will find some axiom set X such that $X \vdash A^- \leftrightarrow A$.

To do that, we use some relation $\blacktriangleright$ between modal propositions. A variant of this relation for non-modal case first came in [Vis02]. The relation $\blacktriangleright$ is defined to be the smallest relation on modal propositional sentences satisfying:

A1. If $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A \to B$, then $A \blacktriangleright B$,

A2. If $A \blacktriangleright B$ and $B \blacktriangleright C$, then $A \blacktriangleright C$,

A3. If $C \blacktriangleright A$ and $C \blacktriangleright B$, then $C \blacktriangleright A \wedge B$,

A4. If $A \blacktriangleright B$, then $\Box A \blacktriangleright \Box B$,

B1. If $A \blacktriangleright C$ and $B \blacktriangleright C$, then $A \vee B \blacktriangleright C$,

B2. Let X be a set of implications, $B := \bigwedge X$ and $A := B \to C$. Also assume that $Z := \{E | E \to F \in X\} \cup \{C\}$. Then $A \blacktriangleright [B]Z$,

B3. If $A \blacktriangleright B$, then for any atomic or boxed C we have $C \to A \blacktriangleright C \to B$.

$A \bowtie B$ means $A \blacktriangleright B$ and $B \blacktriangleright A$. Let us define the theory

$$\mathsf{H}_\sigma := \mathsf{LLe}^+ + \mathsf{CP_a} + \{\Box \mathsf{A} \to \Box \mathsf{B} | \mathsf{A} \blacktriangleright \mathsf{B}\}$$

in which $\mathsf{CP_a}$ is the Completeness Principle restricted to atomic propositions.

Notation. In the rest of the paper, we use $A \equiv B$ as a shorthand for $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A \leftrightarrow B$.

The following theorem, shows that A1-A4 and B1-B3, axiomatize the TNNIL algorithm:

Theorem 4.17. *For any modal proposition A, we have $A \bowtie A^+$.*

Proof. We prove the desired result by induction on $\mathfrak{o}(A)$. Suppose we have the desired result for each proposition B with $\mathfrak{o}(B) < \mathfrak{o}(A)$. We treat A by the following cases.

1. (A1) A is atomic. Then $A^+ = A$, by definition, and result holds trivially.
2. (A1-A4, B1) $A = \Box B, A = B \wedge C, A = B \vee C$. All these cases hold by induction hypothesis. In boxed case, we use of induction hypothesis and A4. In conjunction, we use of A1-A3 and in disjunction we use A1,A2 and B1.
3. $A = B \to C$. There are several sub-cases. similar to definition of NNIL-algorithm, an occurrence of a sub-formula B of A is said to be an *outer occurrence* in A, if it is neither in the scope of a $\Box$ nor in the scope of $\to$.
   (a) (A1-A3) C contains an outer occurrence of a conjunction. We can treat this case using induction hypothesis and TNNIL-algorithm.
   (b) (A1-A3) B contains an outer occurrence of a disjunction. We can treat this case by induction hypothesis and TNNIL-algorithm.
   (c) $B = \bigwedge X$ and $C = \bigvee Y$, where X and Y are sets of implications, atoms and boxed formulae. We have several sub-cases:
      i. (A1-A3, B3) X contains atomic variables. Let p be an atomic variable in X. Set $D := \bigwedge(X \setminus \{p\})$. Then $A^+ \equiv p \to (D \to C)^+$. On the other hand, we have by induction hypothesis and A1,A2 and B3, that $p \to (D \to C)^+ \bowtie p \to (D \to C)$. Finally by A1 and A2 we have $A^+ \bowtie A$.

ii. (A1-A3, B3) X contains boxed formula. Similar to the previous case.

iii. (A1, A2) X contains $\top$ or $\bot$. Trivial.

iv. (A1-A3, B2) X contains only implications. This case needs the axiom B2 and it seems to be the interesting case.
By the definition of A^+, depending on $\mathfrak{o}([B]Z) < \mathfrak{o}(A)$ or not, respectively we have:

$$A^+ \equiv \bigwedge \Big\{ (B \downarrow D \to C)^+ \mid D \in X \Big\} \wedge ([B]Z)^+ \quad \text{or}$$

$$A^+ \equiv \bigwedge \Big\{ (B \downarrow D \to C)^+ \mid D \in X \Big\} \wedge ([B]'Z)^+$$

We only treat the first case, i.e. when $\mathfrak{o}([B]Z) < \mathfrak{o}(A)$. The other case is similar and left to the reader. The reader should note that in the other case we have $\mathfrak{o}([B]'Z) < \mathfrak{o}(A)$ and hence one could apply induction hypothesis over $[B]'Z$. Then by induction hypothesis, A1-A3 and B3 we have:

$$A^+ \blacktriangleright\!\blacktriangleleft \bigwedge \{ B \downarrow D \to C \mid D \in X \} \wedge [B]Z$$

We show that for each $E \in Z$,

$$\mathsf{iK4} \vdash \Big(\bigwedge \{ (B \downarrow D) \to C \mid D \in X \} \wedge [B]E \Big) \to A \tag{2}$$

If $E = C$, we are done by $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash [B]C \to (B \to C)$. So suppose some $E \to F \in X$. We reason in $\mathsf{iK4}$. Assume $\bigwedge \{ (B \downarrow D \to C \mid D \in X \}$, $[B]E$ and B. We want to derive C. We have $(\bigwedge (X \setminus \{E \to F\}) \wedge F) \to C$, $[B]E$ and B. From B and $[B]E$, we derive E. Also from B, we derive $E \to F$, and so F. Hence we have $\bigwedge (X \setminus \{E \to F\}) \wedge F$, which implies C, as desired.
Now Equation 2 implies $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash (\bigwedge \{ (B \downarrow D \to C \mid D \in X \} \wedge [B]Z) \to A$ and hence by A1 and A2 we have $A^+ \blacktriangleright A$.
To show the other way around, i.e. $A \blacktriangleright A^+$, we first show

$$A \blacktriangleright \bigwedge \{ B \downarrow D \to C \mid D \in X \} \wedge [B]Z \tag{3}$$

and then by use of induction hypothesis and A2 we can deduce $A \blacktriangleright A^+$, as desired. So it remains to show that Equation 3 holds. We have $\mathsf{IPC}_\Box \vdash A \to \bigwedge \{ B \downarrow D \to C \mid D \in X \}$, and hence by A1, $A \blacktriangleright \bigwedge \{ B \downarrow D \to C \mid D \in X \}$. On the other hand by A2 we have $A \blacktriangleright [B]Z$. Now A3 implies Equation 3, as desired.

❑

Corollary 4.18. $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \vdash \mathsf{A}^- \leftrightarrow \mathsf{A}$.

Proof. Let $A = B(\Box C_1, \Box C_2, \ldots, \Box C_n)$ where $B(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is a non-modal proposition. By definition of A^-, we have $A^- = B(\Box C_1^+, \ldots, \Box C_n^+)$. Then Theorem 4.17 implies that $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \vdash \Box(\mathsf{C_i})^+ \leftrightarrow \Box \mathsf{C_i}$. Hence $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \vdash \mathsf{A}^- \leftrightarrow \mathsf{A}$, as desired. ❑

4.4 TNNIL-Conservativity of LC over LLe^+

It is clearly the case that $\mathsf{LC} \supseteq \mathsf{LLe}^+$. One can use Kripke models (from the next section) to show $\neg\neg\Box\bot \in \mathsf{LC} \setminus \mathsf{LLe}^+$. This implies that the inclusion is strict. As we will see later in this section, LC and LLe^+ have same TNNIL-theorems. To prove this, we need some lemmas.

Lemma 4.19. $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash \mathsf{Le}^+ \to \mathsf{Le}$.

Proof. Assume some axiom instance of Le, $\Box(B \vee C) \to \Box(\Box B \vee C)$. Let $A := B \vee C$. By axiom schema Le^+, we have $\Box A \to \Box A^l$, which is $\Box(B \vee C) \to \Box(\boxdot B \vee \boxdot C)$. This implies (inside $\mathsf{iK4}$) $\Box(B \vee C) \to \Box(\Box B \vee C)$. ❑

Lemma 4.20. *For each modal proposition A,*

1. *If $A \in \mathsf{NOI}$, then $\mathsf{iK4} + \mathsf{CP}_a \vdash A \to \Box A$.*
2. *$\mathsf{iK4} \vdash A^l \to A$.*
3. *If $A \in \mathsf{NOI}$, then $\mathsf{iK4} + \mathsf{CP_a} \vdash A^l \leftrightarrow A$.*
4. *$\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box A^l \leftrightarrow \Box A$.*

Proof. Proof of parts 1,2 and 3 are routine by induction on A. Part 4 is deduced from part 2, i.e, we have $\Box A^l \to \Box A$, by part 2 and $\Box A^l \leftarrow \Box A$ is exactly Le^+. ❑

Lemma 4.21. *For any TNNIL formula A, we have*

1. *$\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot A^\Box$,*
2. *$\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A^\Box \to A$,*
3. *if $A \in \mathsf{NOI}$, then $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A^\Box \leftrightarrow A$,*
4. *$\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box A \leftrightarrow \Box A^\Box$.*

Proof. We prove all parts by induction on the complexity of A, simultaneously. In the middle of proof, when we are using induction hypothesis of part $i, 1 \leq i \leq 4$, we mention the number in parenthesis that number and also when we deduce some part of lemma, we also mention the number of that part in parentheses as well.

Atomic: For atomic A, we have $A^l = A$ and $A^\Box = \boxdot A$, hence by properties of $\boxdot$ (Lemma 4.14.1), $\mathsf{iK4} \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot A^\Box$ (part 1) and $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A^\Box \leftrightarrow A$ (parts 2 and 3), which by necessitation, that implies $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box A^\Box \leftrightarrow \Box A$ (part 4).

Boxed: Let $A = \Box B$. Then by definition, $A^l = A$ and $A^\Box = \Box B^\Box$. Hence by induction hypothesis (part 1), $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot B^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot B^\Box$. Then $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot\Box B^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot\Box B^\Box$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.20(4), $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box B^l \leftrightarrow \Box B$. Hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot\Box B \leftrightarrow \boxdot\Box B^\Box$ (part 1). Also by induction hypothesis (part 4), $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box B \leftrightarrow \Box B^\Box$. Hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A \leftrightarrow A^\Box$ (parts 2 and 3). That, by necessitation, implies $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box A \leftrightarrow \Box A^\Box$ (part 4).

Conjunction: This case is trivial.

Disjunction: Assume $A = B \vee C$. If $A \in \mathsf{NOI}$, then $B, C \in \mathsf{NOI}$ and hence induction hypothesis for B and C (part 3) implies $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A^\Box \leftrightarrow A$ (part 3). For the other parts, we have, by definition, $A^l = \boxdot B^l \vee \boxdot C^l$. Hence by induction hypothesis (part 1), $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A^l \leftrightarrow (\boxdot B^\Box \vee \boxdot C^\Box)$. Hence, by Lemma 4.14.2, we derive $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot A^\Box$ (part 1). To prove the induction claim 2, note that, by induction hypothesis (part 2), $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash B^\Box \to B$ and $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash C^\Box \to C$. Hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash (B \vee C)^\Box \to (B \vee C)$ (part 2). To prove part 4, we note that, by part 1 for A, we have $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot A^\Box$. Hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box\boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \Box\boxdot A^\Box$, which implies $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box A^l \leftrightarrow \Box A^\Box$ (by Lemma 4.14.1). Now Lemma 4.20.4 implies $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \Box A \leftrightarrow \Box A^\Box$ (part 4).

Implication: Assume $A = B \to C$. Clearly $A \notin \mathsf{NOI}$ and $B \in \mathsf{NOI}$. We only show induction claim for part 1. The other parts can be shown easily. By induction hypothesis (part 3), $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash B^\Box \leftrightarrow B$, and also by Lemma 4.20.1, $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot B \leftrightarrow B$. Note that $\boxdot A^l = \boxdot(B \to C^l)$ and hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot(\boxdot B \to C^l)$. By Lemma 4.20.3, $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash B^l \leftrightarrow B$, hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot(\boxdot B^l \to C^l)$. Now properties of $\boxdot$ implies that $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot(\boxdot B^l \to \boxdot C^l)$, and induction hypothesis (part

1), implies $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot(\boxdot B^\Box \to \boxdot C^\Box)$. This implies, again by properties of $\boxdot$, the desired result, $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash \boxdot A^l \leftrightarrow \boxdot A^\Box$. ❑

Lemma 4.22. *If* $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A$, *then* $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A^\Box$.

Proof. ¿From $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A$ we have $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash \bigwedge_i \boxdot(B_i \to \Box B_i) \to A$. Hence by Proposition 4.16, we have $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash [\bigwedge_i \boxdot(B_i \to \Box B_i) \to A]^\Box$. This implies $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash \bigwedge_i \boxdot(B_i^\Box \to \Box B_i^\Box) \to A^\Box$. Now Lemma 4.14(part 2) implies $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A^\Box$, as desired. ❑

Theorem 4.23. LC *is* TNNIL*-conservative over* LLe^+.

Proof. Let $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A$. From Lemma 4.22 we have $\mathsf{iGL} \vdash A^\Box$ and hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A^\Box$. Now Lemma 4.21.2 implies that $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \vdash A$. ❑

4.5 Kripke semantics for LC

Let us first review results and notations from [Iem01] which will be used here. Assume two binary relations R and S on a set. Define $\alpha(R;S)\gamma$ iff there exists some β such that $\alpha R\beta$ and $\beta S\gamma$.

A Kripke model $\mathcal{K}$, for intuitionistic modal logic, is a quadruple $(K, <, \mathcal{R}, V)$, such that K is a set (we call its elements as nodes), $(K, <)$ is a partial ordering, $\mathcal{R}$ is a binary relation on K such that $(\leq;\mathcal{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, and V is a binary relation between nodes and atomic variables such that $\alpha V p$ and $\alpha \leq \beta$ implies $\beta V p$. Then we can extend V to all modal language with $\mathcal{R}$ corresponding to $\Box$ and $\leq$ for intuitionistic $\to$. More precisely, we define $\Vdash$ inductively as an extension of V as the following.

- $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash p$ iff $\alpha V p$, for atomic variable p,
- $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash A \vee B$ iff $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash A$ or $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash B$,
- $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash A \wedge B$ iff $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash A$ and $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash B$,
- $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \nVdash \bot$ and $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash \top$,
- $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash A \to B$ iff for all $\beta \geq \alpha$, $\mathcal{K}, \beta \Vdash A$ implies $\mathcal{K}, \beta \Vdash B$,
- $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash \Box A$ iff for all β with $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$, we have $\mathcal{K}, \beta \Vdash A$.

In the rest of paper, we may simply write $\alpha \Vdash A$ instead of $\mathcal{K}, \alpha \Vdash A$, if no confusion is likely. By an induction on the complexity of A, one can observe that $\alpha \Vdash A$ implies $\beta \Vdash A$ for all A and $\alpha \leq \beta$. We define the following notions.

- If $\alpha \leq \beta$, β is called to be above α and α is beneath β. If $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$, β is called to be a successor of α. We define $\mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ to be the set of all successors of β.
- A Kripke model is finite if its set of nodes is finite. A Kripke model is tree-frame if its set of nodes with ordering $\leq$ is a tree.
- A Kripke model $\mathcal{K} = (K, <, \mathcal{R}, V)$ is reverse well-founded iff K is well-founded with the ordering $\mathcal{R}^{-1}$.
- $\mathcal{K}$ is called *brilliant* iff $(\mathcal{R};\leq) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$.
- $\mathcal{K}$ is called *perfect* iff it is brilliant, reverse well-founded and $R \subseteq <$.
- Suppose X is a set of propositions that is closed under sub-formula (we call such X to be adequate). An X-saturated set of propositions Γ with respect to some theory T is a subset of X that
  - for each $A \vee B \in X$, $T + \Gamma \vdash A \vee B$ implies $A \in \Gamma$ or $B \in \Gamma$.

– for each $A \in X$, $T + \Gamma \vdash A$ implies $A \in \Gamma$.

Lemma 4.24. *Let $T \nvdash A$ and let X be an adequate set. Then there is an X-saturated set Γ such that $T \cap X \subseteq \Gamma \nvdash A$.*

Proof. See [Iem01]. ❑

Theorem 4.25. LC *is sound and complete for finite perfect Kripke models with tree frames.*

Proof. Soundness part can easily be proved by induction on the complexity of formulae. For the completeness, we first find some finite perfect Kripke counter-model for each A with $\mathsf{LC} \nvdash A$, and then convert it to a perfect Kripke model with finite tree frame.

Assume $\mathsf{LC} \nvdash A$. Let $\mathsf{Sub}(A)$ be the set of sub-formulae of A. Then define

$$X := \{B, \Box B \mid B \in \mathsf{Sub}(A)\}$$

It is obvious that X is a finite adequate set. We define $\mathcal{K} = (K, < \mathcal{R}, V)$ as follows. Take K as the set of all X-saturated sets with respect to LC, and $\leq$ is the subset relation over K. Define $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$ iff for all $\Box B \in X$, $\Box B \in \alpha$ implies $B \in \beta$, and also there exists some $\Box C \in \beta \setminus \alpha$. Finally define $\alpha V p$ iff $p \in \alpha$, for atomic p.

It only remains showing that $\mathcal{K}$ is a finite perfect Kripke model that refutes A. To do this, we first show by induction on $B \in X$ that $b \in \alpha$ iff $\alpha \Vdash B$, for each $\alpha \in K$. The only non-trivial case is $B = \Box C$. Let $\Box C \notin \alpha$. We must show $\alpha \nVdash \Box C$. The other direction is easier to prove and we leave it to reader. Let $\beta_0 := \{D \in X \mid \alpha \vdash \Box D\}$. If $\beta_0, \Box C \vdash C$, then, by definition of β_0, we have $\alpha \vdash \Box \beta_0$ and hence by Löb's axiom, $\alpha \vdash \Box C$, contradicting $\Box C \notin \alpha$. Hence $\beta_0, \Box C \nvdash C$ and so there exists some X-saturated set β such that $\beta \nvdash C$, $\beta \supseteq \beta_0 \cup \{\Box C\}$. Hence $\beta \in K$ and $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$. Then by induction hypothesis, $\beta \nVdash C$ and hence $\alpha \nVdash \Box C$.

Since $\mathsf{LC} \nvdash A$, by Lemma 4.24, there exists some X-saturated set $\alpha \in K$ such that $\alpha \nvdash A$, and hence by the above argument we have $\alpha \nVdash A$.

$\mathcal{K}$ trivially satisfies all the properties of perfect Kripke model. As a sample, we show that why $\mathcal{R} \subseteq <$ holds. Assume $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$ and let $B \in \alpha$. If B is boxed formula, like C, then by definition, $C \in \beta$ and hence $\beta \vdash B$ and we are done. So assume B is not a boxed formula. Then by definition of X, we have $\Box B \in X$ and by the completeness axiom in LC, we have $\alpha \vdash \Box B$ and hence by definition of $\mathcal{R}$, it is the case that $B \in \beta$. This shows $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ and hence $\alpha \leq \beta$. But α is not equal to β, because $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$ implies existence of some $\Box C \in \beta \setminus \alpha$. Hence $\alpha < \beta$, as desired.

Now we explain how to convert $\mathcal{K}$ to a Kripke model $\mathcal{T} := (T, <_t, \mathcal{R}_t, V_t) \nVdash A$ with tree frame. Let T be the set of all finite (excluding empty sequence) sequences $\langle \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ such that $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \ldots < \alpha_n$. Let $<_t$ be the initial segment relation. For any $\alpha \in T$, let $f(\alpha)$ be the final element of sequence. Then we define $\alpha \mathcal{R}_t \beta$ iff $f(\alpha) \mathcal{R} f(\beta)$, for non-empty α and β. Finally, define $\alpha V_t p$, for atomic p, iff $f(\alpha) V p$. Now one can prove by induction on B, that for any $\alpha \in T$, $\mathcal{T}, \alpha \Vdash B$ iff $\mathcal{K}, f(\alpha) \Vdash B$. Hence $\mathcal{T} \nVdash A$. ❑

Theorem 4.26. LC *is decidable.*

Proof. Let A be given. Assume that n is the number of elements of X defined in the above proof. It shows us that we should only check if for all Kripke models $\mathcal{K}$ with 2^n nodes (only over atomic variables that appear in A), we have $\mathcal{K} \Vdash A$. If that was the case, we say "yes" to $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A$?, otherwise the answer is "no" to $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A$?. ❑

Relation to intuitionistic non-modal Kripke models

The usual intuitionistic non-modal Kripke models are the same Kripke models as is defined above, without the additional relation $\mathcal{R}$. Extending it to all non-modal propositions is the same as the one for modal language. It is well-known that IPC is sound and complete for non-modal Kripke models. We have the following conservativity result.

Theorem 4.27. $\mathsf{LC}+\Box\bot$ *is conservative over* IPC *in non-modal language, i.e. for any non-modal proposition* A*, if* $\mathsf{LC}+\Box\bot\vdash A$*, then* $\mathsf{IPC}\vdash A$*.*

Proof. We reason contrapositively. Assume that $\mathsf{IPC}\nvdash A$. Then by completeness, there exists some non-modal Kripke model $\mathcal{K}=(K,\leq,V)\nVdash A$. Let $\mathcal{R}:=\emptyset$ and $\mathcal{K}':=(K,\leq,\mathcal{R},V)$. It is easy to observe that $\mathcal{K}'$ is a Kripke model and for all non-modal proposition B and $u\in K$, we have $\mathcal{K},u\Vdash B$ iff $\mathcal{K}',u\Vdash B$. Hence we have $\mathcal{K}'\nVdash A$. Now soundness theorem (Theorem 4.25) implies $\mathsf{LC}+\Box\bot\nvdash A$. ❑

5 Transforming Kripke models

Smorýnski ([Smo73a]) showed that one could simulate the behaviour of a propositional non-modal Kripke model by a first-order Kripke model. Also Solovay ([Sol76]) showed that one could simulate the behaviour of a Kripke model of classical modal logic inside PA. However, the combination of these two ideas could be assumed as major obstacle towards the characterization of the provability logic of HA. In this section, we will show that one could simulate the behaviour of some special kind of Kripke models for intuitionistic modal logic, i.e. perfect Kripke models, by first-order Kripke-models of HA. This would lead us to the characterization of the Σ_1-provability logic of HA. More precisely, we will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Let* $\mathcal{K}_0=(K_0,\mathcal{R}_0,<_0,V_0)$ *be a finite perfect Kripke model with tree frame and* $\Gamma\subseteq\mathsf{TNNIL}^-$ *be a finite set. Then there exists some arithmetical* Σ_1*-substitution* σ *and a Kripke model* $\mathcal{K}_1=(K_0,<_0,\mathfrak{M})$ *such that for all* $A\in\Gamma$ *and* $\alpha\in K_0$ *we have* $\mathcal{K}_0,\alpha\Vdash A$ *iff* $\mathcal{K}_1,\alpha\Vdash\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$*.*

Before we continue with the rather long proof of Theorem 5.1, that will take up whole of this section, let us explain the outline of the proof.

First we define a recursive function F (the Solovay function) with the domain of natural numbers. $F(0)$ is defined to be some fresh node α_0. The function F, always climbs over the frame $(K_0,\mathcal{R}_0,<_0)$, but it is reluctant to do so. It only goes to some node β at some stage $n+1$ (i.e. $F(n+1)=\beta$), if $n+1$ is a witness (in some sense which would be clarified in this section) for this statement

$$\text{“}F\text{ is not going to stay in }\beta\text{ forever or }\neg\sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(\Box\varphi_\beta)\text{”}.$$

In this definition, φ_β is the conjunction of all sentences in the set $S=\{B\in\mathsf{Sub}(\Gamma)\mid B\in\mathsf{TNNIL}\}$ such that $\beta\Vdash\varphi_\beta$. Here, $\mathsf{Sub}(\Gamma)$ is the set of sub-formulas of some formula in Γ. The most interesting (and difficult part to prove as well) property of the function F is that this function actually (in the standard model of arithmetic $\mathbb{N}$) does not climb over tree at all, i.e. the function F is constant, $\mathbb{N}\models\forall xF(x)=\alpha_0$. In contrast with the classical case, proving this fact for the intuitionistic case is rather complicated.

Let $L\succcurlyeq\alpha$ denote “the function F would go above α or remain equal to α”. Then we define the substitution $\sigma(p):=\bigvee_{\alpha\Vdash p}L\succcurlyeq\alpha$. Then we define the I-frame $\mathcal{I}=(K_0,<_0,T)$, where T_α is defined to be PA plus the following statement: “The limit of the function F is α”. Finally, with the aid of Theorem 5.28 we find the desired Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1$, by assigning an appropriate classical model of T_α to the node α. We will show that $T_\alpha\vdash\Box\varphi_\alpha$ (Corollary 5.22) and also $T_\alpha\vdash\neg\Box B^\Diamond$ for any $\alpha\nVdash\Box B$ (Theorem 5.14). In this way, we can simulate the role of modal operator $\Box$ in the first-order Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1$.

Notation. In the rest of this section, we fix the Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_0=(K_0,\mathcal{R}_0,<_0,V_0)$ and the set $S:=\{B\in\mathsf{Sub}(\Gamma)\mid B\in\mathsf{TNNIL}\}$. We also assume that $\alpha_0\notin K_0$ and define

$$\mathcal{R}:=\mathcal{R}_0\cup\{(\alpha_0,\alpha)\mid\alpha\in K_0\}\qquad<:=<_0\cup\{(\alpha_0,\alpha)\mid\alpha\in K_0\}\qquad K:=K_0\cup\{\alpha_0\}$$

In other words, we add α_0 in the beneath of all the nodes of $\mathcal{K}_0$.

5.1 Definition of the Solovay function

Solovay used some special recursive function (here we call it the *Solovay function*) to prove the completeness of GL (The Gödel-Löb logic) for arithmetical interpretations in PA (See [Sol76]). The Solovay function in [Sol76], is a function $G : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow X$, in which X is a finite partially ordered set ordered by $\preccurlyeq$. The recursive definition of G is such that G climbs over X, i.e. $G(x) \preccurlyeq G(x+1)$ and moreover, it goes to some new node iff there exists a witness that G would not remain there. More precisely, $G(x+1) \neq G(x)$ iff $x+1$ be the code of a proof (in PA) for the fact that the limit of the function G is not $G(x+1)$. Although it is true (in the standard model) that G would not climb over X (i.e. G is a constant function), PA could not prove this fact. In this subsection, we define a similar recursive function (we name it F) for the proof of our main theorem (Theorem 5.1), and state and prove some of its properties.

For technical reasons, we first define the set of all codes of sequences $\langle F(0), \ldots, F(x)\rangle$ by an arithmetical formula $\theta(z)$, and then define $\phi_\theta(x,y) := \exists z(\mathsf{lth}(z) = x+1 \wedge \theta(z) \wedge \hat{z} = y)$ as the graph of a function F_θ and finally, let $F := F_\theta$. It is clear that we can also define $\theta_F(z)$ from the function F in the following way.

$$\theta_F(z :=) \exists x(z = \langle F(0), \ldots, F(x)\rangle)$$

To be able to speak about $\mathcal{K}$ inside HA, we need some conventions. Suppose that $K = \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k\}$. Hence for each $\alpha \in K$, there exists a unique index $0 \leq i \leq k$ such that $\alpha = \alpha_i$. We define $\overline{\alpha}$ to be $\overline{i}$ ($\overline{n}$ is n-th numeral in the language of arithmetic, i.e. $\overline{i} := S^i(0)$). We may simply use α instead of $\overline{\alpha}$, if no confusion is likely. The following notations for arbitrary terms t, s in the language of arithmetic will be used later.

- $\overline{K}(t) := \bigvee_{\alpha \in K}(t = \overline{\alpha})$,
- $t \prec s := \bigvee_{\alpha \lneq \beta}(t = \overline{\alpha} \wedge s = \overline{\beta})$, $t \preccurlyeq s := \bigvee_{\alpha \leq \beta}(t = \overline{\alpha} \wedge s = \overline{\beta})$,
- $t\overline{\mathcal{R}}s := \bigvee_{\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta}(t = \overline{\alpha} \wedge s = \overline{\beta})$,
- $\varphi_\alpha := \bigwedge_{B \in S, \alpha \Vdash \Box B} B$.

In the following definition, $L_\theta = y$ as the arithmetical formula equivalent to "The limit of the function F_θ is equal to y". Similarly, define $\alpha \prec L_\theta$ and so on.

Definition 5.2. *Let $\theta(z)$ be a Σ_1-formula in the language of arithmetic. Then*

- *$L_\theta = y$ is a shorthand for $\exists u \forall z(\theta(u * z) \to \hat{z} = y)$,*
- *for each $\alpha \in K$, $\alpha \preccurlyeq L_\theta$, $\alpha \prec L_\theta$ and $\alpha \mathcal{R} L_\theta$ are shorthand for $\bigvee_{\alpha \leq \beta} \exists x(\theta(x) \wedge \hat{x} = \beta)$, $\bigvee_{\alpha \lneq \beta} \exists x(\theta(x) \wedge \hat{x} = \beta)$ and $\bigvee_{\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta} \exists x(\theta(x) \wedge \hat{x} = \beta)$, respectively,*
- *the arithmetical substitution σ is defined on propositional variable p by*

$$\sigma(p) := \bigvee_{\beta \Vdash p} \beta \preccurlyeq L_\theta.$$

  and finally, we extend σ to all propositions by interpreting $\Box$ as provability in HA , i.e., $\sigma_\theta := \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}$, in which σ_{HA} is defined from σ as in Definition 2.1,
- *let g be a recursive function with $\theta_g(z)$ as the formula $\exists x(z = \langle g(0), \ldots, g(x)\rangle)$. We define $L_g = y$, $L_g \succ \alpha$, $L_g \succeq \alpha$, $\alpha \mathcal{R} L_g$ and σ_g to be $L_{\theta_g} = y$, $L_{\theta_g} \succ \alpha$, $L_{\theta_g} \succeq \alpha$, $\alpha \mathcal{R} L_{\theta_g}$ and σ_{θ_g}, respectively.*

Following Berarducci ([Ber90]), we define a primitive recursive function as follows:

$$r_\theta(\bar{\alpha}, x) = \mathsf{min}(\{k \mid \exists u \leq x \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{PA}_k}(u, \ulcorner \neg(L = \alpha \wedge \Box\sigma_\theta(\varphi_\alpha))\urcorner)\} \cup \{x+1\})$$

Note that $r_\theta(x, y)$ depends also on a Σ_1-formula appeared in the subscript of σ. we may omit subscripts of the substitution σ and the function r when no confusion is likely.

A variant of this function was first appeared in [Ber90], to define Solovay functions for characterizing interpretability logic of PA. It is easy to observe that $r(\alpha, x)$ is always equal or less than $x+1$, and $r(\alpha, x) \leq x$ iff

$$\exists y \leq x \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{PA}}(y, \ulcorner \neg(L = \alpha \wedge \Box\sigma_F(\varphi_\alpha))\urcorner)$$

Now we are in a position to define the Solovay-like function for $\mathcal{K}$. Informally speaking, $F : \mathbb{N} \to K$ is defined in such a way that fulfils the following conditions. $F(0) := \alpha_0$, and

$$F(x+1) := \begin{cases} \beta & \text{if } (x)_0 = \langle 1, \beta\rangle, F(x) R \beta \text{ and } r_F(\beta, x+1) \leq x+1, \\ \gamma & \text{if } (x)_0 = \langle 2, \gamma\rangle, \neg F(x) R \gamma \text{ and } F(x) \leq \gamma \text{ and} \\ & \quad r_F(\gamma, x+1) < r_F(F(x), x+1) \text{ and } \quad F(r_F(\gamma, x+1)) \mathcal{R} \gamma, \\ F(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

As it is clear from the definition, F is used in its own definition, i.e. we are in a loop. This will be overcomed by the Diagonalization lemma. To be able to define F, we first define $\theta(z)$ and then define $F(x) = y$ (the graph of the function F) as

$$\exists z(\mathsf{lth}(z) = x+1 \wedge \theta(z) \wedge (z)_x = y)$$

By Diagonalization lemma (Lemma 3.5), we find a Δ_0 formula $\theta(y)$ such that

$$\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \theta(y) \leftrightarrow (\mathsf{lth}(y) \geq 1 \wedge (y)_0 = \overline{\alpha_0} \wedge \forall x < \mathsf{lth}(y)(x \neq 0 \to \chi(x, y))) \tag{5}$$

in which $\chi(x, y)$ is defined as disjunction of the following three formulae:

$$\chi_1 := \bigvee_{\beta \in K} [(x)_0 = \langle 1, \bar{\beta}\rangle \wedge (y)_x = \bar{\beta} \wedge (y)_{x\dot{-}1} \bar{\mathcal{R}} \bar{\beta} \wedge r(\bar{\beta}, x) \leq x]$$

$$\chi_2 := \bigvee_{\beta \in K} [(x)_0 = \langle 2, \bar{\beta}\rangle \wedge (y)_x = \bar{\beta} \wedge \neg(y)_{x\dot{-}1} \bar{\mathcal{R}} \bar{\beta} \wedge (y)_{x\dot{-}1} \preccurlyeq \bar{\beta} \wedge r((y)_x, x) < r((y)_{x\dot{-}1}, x)) \wedge (y)_{r((y)_x, x)} \bar{\mathcal{R}} (y)_x)]$$

$$\chi_3 := [(y)_x = (y)_{x\dot{-}1}] \wedge \bigwedge_{\beta \in K} \neg[(y)_x \bar{\mathcal{R}} \bar{\beta} \wedge (x)_0 = \langle 1, \bar{\beta}\rangle \wedge r(\bar{\beta}, x) \leq x] \wedge \bigwedge_{\beta \in K} \neg[(y)_{x\dot{-}1} \preccurlyeq \bar{\beta} \wedge \neg(y)_{x\dot{-}1} \bar{\mathcal{R}} \bar{\beta} \wedge (x)_0 = \langle 2, \bar{\beta}\rangle \wedge r(\bar{\beta}, x) < r((y)_{x\dot{-}1}, x) \wedge (y)_{r(\bar{\beta}, x)} \bar{\mathcal{R}} \bar{\beta})]$$

In the above formulae, $r(x, y)$ is $r_\theta(x, y)$. Now we show that a provably total recursive function F can be defined from $\theta(y)$.

Lemma 5.3. *The formula θ is Δ_0 and*

- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash (\mathsf{lth}(y_1) \neq 0 \wedge \theta(y_1 * y_2)) \to \theta(y_1)$,
- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash (\theta(y_1) \wedge \theta(y_2) \wedge \mathsf{lth}(y_1) = \mathsf{lth}(y_2)) \to y_1 = y_2$.
- $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \forall x \exists y(\mathsf{lth}(y) = x+1 \wedge \theta(y))$.

Proof. It is not difficult to observe that the first part holds by definition of θ in Equation 5. To prove the other parts, it is enough to show $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \forall x \exists! y(\mathsf{lth}(y) = x+1 \wedge \theta(y))$, in which $!\exists$, as usual, is the unique existenial quantifier. This can simply be done by induction on x. ❑

Now, let us define $\phi(x,y) := \exists z(\theta(z) \wedge \mathsf{lth}(z) = x+1 \wedge \hat{z} = y)$. Note that $\phi(x,y)$ is actually a Δ_0 formula. The reason is the following. we can bound existential quantifier by the primitive recursive function $h(z)$ with the following primitive recursive definition:

- $h(0) := \langle k \rangle$, in which k is the number of nodes of Kripke model,
- $h(z+1) := h(z) * \langle k \rangle$.

Hence $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \phi(x,y) \leftrightarrow \exists z \leq h(z)[\mathsf{lth}(z) = x+1 \wedge (z)_{x+1} = y \wedge \phi(z)]$.

Remark 5.4. The above lemma (Lemma 5.3) says that $\phi(x,y)$ is the graph of a Δ_0- function F. In the rest of the paper, we use F as a function symbol with the graph $\phi(x,y)$. We use σ and L instead of σ_θ and L_θ, respectively. For simplicity of notations, we also define $B^\Diamond := \sigma(B)$.

Now one can observe that the function F fulfils the recursive conditions of Equation 4.

5.2 Elementary properties of the Solovay function

In this part, we will see some elementary properties of the function F.

Lemma 5.5. *The function F has the follwing properties:*

1. $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \forall x, y(\bar{F}(x) \preccurlyeq \bar{F}(x+y))$,
2. *for any $\alpha \in K$,* $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \alpha \rightarrow \bigvee_{\alpha \leq \beta} L = \beta$,
3. *for any $\alpha \in K$,* $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \alpha \prec L \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{\alpha < \beta} L = \beta$ *and* $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \alpha \bar{\mathcal{R}} L \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta} L = \beta$.

Proof. 1. By recursive definition of F, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \bar{F}(x) \preccurlyeq \bar{F}(x+1)$. Let $A(y) := \bar{F}(x) \preccurlyeq \bar{F}(x+y)$ and use induction on y in $A(y)$.

2. We prove this fact by induction (in meta-language) on the tree $(K, \lneqq)$ with reverse order. Suppose that for all $\beta \gneqq \alpha$, we have $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \beta \rightarrow \bigvee_{\beta \leq \gamma} L = \gamma$. Then

$$\mathsf{PA} \vdash \bar{F}(x) = \alpha \rightarrow (\forall y \geq x \bar{F}(y) = \alpha \vee \exists y \geq x \bar{F}(y) \neq \alpha)$$

   By part 1 and definition of $L = \alpha$, we get $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \bar{F}(x) = \alpha \rightarrow (L = \alpha \vee \exists y \geq x(\alpha \prec \bar{F}(y)))$. Now induction hypothesis implies $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \bar{F}(x) = \alpha \rightarrow \bigvee_{\beta \geq \alpha} L = \beta$.

3. Proof of this part is an immediate consequence of part 2 and perfectness of $\mathcal{K}$.

❑

Lemma 5.6. *For any $\alpha, \beta \in K$ with $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$,* $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash L = \alpha \rightarrow \neg \Box^+ \neg (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$.

Proof. We argue inside HA_0. Assume $L = \alpha$ and $\mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{PA}}(x, \ulcorner \neg (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \urcorner)$. Let $y > x$ such that $(y+1)_0 = \langle 2, \beta \rangle$. Then because $L = \alpha$, we have $F(y) = \alpha$. On the other hand, by recursive definition of F, $F(y+1) := \beta$, a contradiction. ❑

Lemma 5.7. *For any $\delta, \alpha, \beta \in K$ with $\delta \mathcal{R} \alpha \leq \beta$,* $\mathsf{HA}_0 + L = \delta \vdash (L = \alpha \wedge \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \rhd (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$.

Proof. If $\alpha\mathcal{R}\beta$, by Lemma 5.6, $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash L = \alpha \to \neg\Box^+\neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. So

$$\mathbb{N} \models \Box^+(L = \alpha \to \neg\Box^+\neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond))$$

and hence by Lemma 3.6, we can deduce $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash L = \alpha \rhd (L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. So assume $\alpha\not\mathcal{R}\beta$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$. By definition of $A \rhd B$, we must show

$$\mathsf{HA}_0 + L = \delta \vdash \forall x\Box^+[(L = \alpha \wedge \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \to \neg\Box_x^+\neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)].$$

We work inside HA_0. Assume $L = \delta$ and fix some large enough x such that $F(x) = \delta$. Then for each $u \leq x$, we have $F(u)\mathcal{R}\beta$. Now work in the scope of $\Box^+$. By Σ-completeness of PA, we have $\forall u \leq x F(u)\mathcal{R}\beta$. Assume $L = \alpha$, $\Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$ and $\Box_x^+\neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. We should deduce $\bot$. By $\Box_x^+\neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$, for sufficiently large y (larger than $\langle 2, \beta\rangle^* z$, in which z is a proof code in PA_x for $\neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$), we have $r(\beta, y) \leq x$. If $r(\alpha, y) \leq r(\beta, y)$, then $\Box_x^+\neg(L = \alpha \wedge \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond)$, and hence by Lemma 3.7, we have $\neg(L = \alpha \wedge \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond)$, a contradiction. If $r(\alpha, y) > r(\beta, y)$, since $r(\beta, y) \leq x$, then $F(r(\beta, y))\mathcal{R}\beta$. So by recursive definition of F, there exists some $z \geq y$ such that $F(z) = \beta$, contradicting $L = \alpha$. ❑

5.3 Deciding the boxed formulas

In this subsection, we will show that $\mathsf{HA} + L = \alpha + \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$ can decide boxed propositions in S. More precisely, for all $\Box B \in S$ and $\alpha \in K$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathsf{HA} + L = \alpha + \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \vdash \Box B^\Diamond & \text{if } \alpha \Vdash \Box B \\ \mathsf{HA} + L = \alpha + \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \vdash \neg\Box B^\Diamond & \text{if } \alpha \nVdash \Box B \end{cases}$$

Note that by definition of φ_α, if $\alpha \Vdash \Box B$, then B is a conjunct of φ_α. Hence in case $\alpha \Vdash \Box B$, we obviously have $\mathsf{HA} + \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \vdash \Box B^\Diamond$. Moreover we will show in subsection 5.4 (Corollary 5.22) that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \alpha \to \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$ for $\alpha \in K_0$, and then the following improvement of the above equation holds:

$$\begin{cases} \mathsf{HA} + L = \alpha \vdash \Box B^\Diamond & \text{if } \alpha \Vdash \Box B \\ \mathsf{HA} + L = \alpha \vdash \neg\Box B^\Diamond & \text{if } \alpha \nVdash \Box B \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.8. *Let $B \in S$ be such that all occurrences of $\to$ in B are in the scope of some $\Box$ ($B \in \mathsf{NOI}$), $\alpha \in K$ and $\alpha \Vdash B$. Then $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash (L = \alpha \wedge \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \to B^\Diamond$. Moreover, this argument is formalizable and provable in HA_0, i.e. $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \Box_0((L = \alpha \wedge \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \to B^\Diamond)$.*

Proof. One can prove $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash (L = \alpha \wedge \Box\varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \to B^\Diamond$, by induction on the complexity of B. Then by Lemma 3.6, we derive its formalized form in HA_0. ❑

Let A be a TNNIL-formula such that $\alpha \nVdash_{\max} A$, that means that $\alpha \nVdash A$ and for all $\beta \gneqq \alpha$, $\beta \Vdash A$. In Lemma 5.11 and Lemma 5.12, we need to put $\Box_x$ before all occurrences of subformulas B in the right of $\to$, when it is not the case that $\alpha \nVdash_{\max} B$. This is the content of the following definition.

Definition 5.9. Let A be a modal proposition, $\alpha \in K$ and x be a variable. We define the first-order sentence $d(A, \alpha, x)$, with induction on A. If this is not the case that $\alpha \nVdash_{\max} A$, then we define $d(A, \alpha, x) := \Box_x A^\Diamond$, and if $\alpha \nVdash_{\max} A$, we define the formula $d(A, \alpha, x)$ by cases:

- A is atomic or boxed. $d(A, \alpha, x) := A^\Diamond$,
- $A = B \to C$. $d(A, \alpha, x) := B^\Diamond \to d(C, \alpha, x)$,
- $A = B \wedge C$. if $\alpha \nVdash_{\max} B$ then $d(A, \alpha, x) := d(B, \alpha, x)$, else $d(A, \alpha, x) := d(C, \alpha, x)$,

- $A = B \vee C$. $d(A, \alpha, x) := d(B, \alpha, x) \vee d(C, \alpha, x)$.

In the following lemma, we use definition of $\sigma_l(A, x)$ from subsection 3.3:

Lemma 5.10. *Let A be a modal proposition, $\alpha \in K$ such that $\alpha \nvDash_{\max} A$. Then*

$$\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \sigma_l(A, x) \to d(A, \alpha, x)$$

Proof. By third part of Lemma 3.16, we have $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \sigma_l(A, x) \to A^{\Diamond}$. Then the result follows by induction on A. ❑

Lemma 5.11. *Let $A \in S$ and let $\alpha \in K$ such that $\alpha \nvDash_{\max} B$. Then there exists some provably (in HA) total recursive function g_A^α such that*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_x A^{\Diamond} \to \Box_{g_A^\alpha(x)} d(A, \alpha, g_A^\alpha(x))$$

Proof. Use Lemma 3.18 and Lemma 5.10. ❑

Define $m \in \omega$ as the maximum of the following n_i's.

- n_1. By Lemma 5.11, we can find some n_1 such that for each $B \in S$ and $\alpha \in K$ with $\alpha \nvDash_{\max} B$, g_B^α is provably total in HA_{n_1}.
- n_2. For each $\alpha \in K, B \in S$ such that $\alpha \nvDash_{\max} B$, by Lemma 5.11, there exists some n such that HA_n proves the desired sentence of the Lemma. Let n_2 be the maximum of such n.
- n_3. By Lemma 3.12, for each $\alpha \in K$, there exists some provably (in HA) total function h_α, such that $h_\alpha(x) \geq x$ and $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box_{h_\alpha(x)}(\Box_x \neg(L = \alpha \wedge \varphi_\alpha^{\Diamond}) \to \neg(L = \alpha \wedge \varphi_\alpha^{\Diamond}))$. Hence there exists some $n_\alpha \in \omega$ such that h_α is provably total in HA_{n_α} and

  $$\mathsf{HA}_{n_\alpha} \vdash \Box_{h_\alpha(x)}(\Box_x \neg(L = \alpha \wedge \varphi_\alpha^{\Diamond}) \to \neg(L = \alpha \wedge \varphi_\alpha^{\Diamond}))$$

  Let $n_3 := \max\{n_\alpha | \alpha \in K\}$.

Then define $f_B^\alpha(x)$ as the maximum of $g_B^\alpha(x)$ and m. Assume some $B \in S$. We define the provably (in HA_m) total recursive function f_B, by induction on the complexity of B:

$$f_B(x) := \begin{cases} \max(X) & \text{if } X = \{h_\beta(f_C(f_B^\alpha(x))) \mid C \in \mathsf{Sub}(B), C \neq B, \alpha, \beta \in K, \alpha \nvDash_{\max} B\} \neq \emptyset \\ x & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

where h_β is as we stated in defining n_3. From the above definition, one can observe that for each atomic $C \in S$, the set X is empty. Hence we have $f_C(x) = x$. Since each formula B has some atomic sub-formula C, one can deduce that $f_B(x) \geq f_B^\beta(x)$, in which $\beta \nvDash_{\max} B$. Moreover, all of the above functions are provably total in HA_m.

Lemma 5.12. *Let $B, E \in S$ and $\beta \in K$, such that $\beta \nvDash_{\max} B$, $\beta \nvDash_{\max} E$ and $B \in \mathsf{Sub}(E)$. Then*

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F(f_E(x))\mathcal{R}\beta \wedge \Box_x E^{\Diamond}\right) \to \Box_{f_E(x)} \left((L = \beta \wedge \varphi_\beta^{\Diamond}) \to \neg d(B, \beta, f_E^\beta(x))\right) \tag{6}$$

Proof. We prove Equation 6 by induction on the complexity of B. As induction hypothesis, assume that for any sub-formula C of B ($C \neq B$) and any $E' \in S$ and $\gamma \in K$, such that $C \in \mathsf{Sub}(E')$ and $\gamma \nvDash_{\max} C, E'$, we have

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F(f'_E(x))\mathcal{R}\gamma \wedge \Box_x E'^{\Diamond}\right) \to \Box_{f_{E'}(x)} \left((L = \gamma \wedge \varphi_\gamma^{\Diamond}) \to \neg d(C, \gamma, f_{E'}^\beta(x))\right)$$

We consider different cases.

- B is atomic. Then $d(B,\beta,f_B^\beta(x)) = B^\Diamond = \sigma(B)$ and the desired result holds by definition of the substitution σ and $\beta \nVdash B$ and also by first part of Lemma 5.5,
- $B = \Box C$: Then $d(B,\beta,f_B^\beta(x)) = B^\Diamond = \Box C^\Diamond$. Since $\beta \nVdash_{\max} \Box C$, there exists some γ such that $\beta \mathcal{R} \gamma \nVdash_{\max} C$. Then, by induction hypothesis,

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F\left(f_C\left(x\right)\right)\mathcal{R}\gamma \wedge \Box_x C^\Diamond\right) \to \Box_{f_C(x)}\left((L = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \to \neg d(C,\gamma,f_C^\gamma(x))\right)$$

  By Lemma 5.11, we have $\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \Box_x C^\Diamond \to \Box_{f_C(x)} d(C,\gamma,f_C^\gamma(x))$. Hence

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(L = \beta \wedge \Box C^\Diamond\right) \to \Box\neg\left(L = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond\right)$$

  By Lemma 5.6, we can deduce $\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \neg\left(L = \beta \wedge \Box C^\Diamond\right)$. Hence by Lemma 3.6, $\mathsf{HA}_0 \vdash \Box_m\neg\left(L = \beta \wedge \Box C^\Diamond\right)$. Since $f_B(x) \geq m$, we have $\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \Box_{f_B(x)}\Big((L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to \neg d(B,\beta,f_B^\beta(x))\Big)$, which implies Equation 6.
- $B = C \to D$. In this case $\beta \Vdash C \in \mathsf{NOI}$, $\beta \nVdash_{\max} D$ and $d(B,\beta,f_B^\beta(x)) = C^\Diamond \to d(D,\beta,f_B^\beta(x))$. Hence, by induction hypothesis,

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F\left(f_E\left(x\right)\right)\mathcal{R}\beta \wedge \Box_x E^\Diamond\right) \to \Box_{f_E(x)}\Big((L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to \neg d(D,\beta,f_E^\beta(x))\Big) \tag{7}$$

  Then by Lemma 5.8,

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F\left(f_E\left(x\right)\right)\mathcal{R}\beta \wedge \Box_x E^\Diamond\right) \to \Box_{f_E(x)}\Big((L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to \neg(C^\Diamond \to d(D,\beta,f_E^\beta(x)))\Big)$$

- $B = C \wedge D$. Since $\beta \nVdash_{\max} B$, either $\beta \nVdash_{\max} C$ or $\beta \nVdash_{\max} D$ holds. We only treat the case that $\beta \nVdash_{\max} C$. The other case is similar. Assume that $\beta \nVdash_{\max} C$. Then by definition, $d(B,\beta,y) = d(C,\beta,y)$. Now the induction hypothesis for C, directly implies the desired result (Equation 6).
- $B = C \vee D$. This case is the interesting one. We have 4 sub-cases: (1) $\beta \nVdash_{\max} C$ and $\beta \nVdash_{\max} D$, (2) not $\beta \nVdash_{\max} C$ and $\beta \nVdash_{\max} D$, (3) $\beta \nVdash_{\max} C$ and not $\beta \nVdash_{\max} D$, (4) not $\beta \nVdash_{\max} C$ and not $\beta \nVdash_{\max} D$. We only treat the case (3) here. Other cases could be treated similarly. Assume that the case (3) occurs. By definition, $d(B,\beta,f_E^\beta(x)) = d(C,\beta,f_E^\beta(x)) \vee \Box_{f_E^\beta(x)} D^\Diamond$. ¿From the induction hypothesis for C,

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F(f_E(x))\mathcal{R}\beta \wedge \Box_x E^\Diamond\right) \to \Box_{f_E(x)}\Big((L = \beta \wedge \varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to \neg d(C,\beta,f_E^\beta(x))\Big) \tag{8}$$

  So it is enough to show that

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F(f_E(x))\mathcal{R}\beta \wedge \Box_x E^\Diamond\right) \to \Box_{f_E(x)}\Big((L = \beta \wedge \varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to \neg\Box_{f_E^\beta(x)} D^\Diamond\Big) \tag{9}$$

  Since $\beta \nVdash D$ and not $\beta \nVdash_{\max} D$, there exists some $\gamma \gneqq \beta$ such that $\gamma \nVdash_{\max} D$. If $\beta \mathcal{R} \gamma$, then we can repeat the reasoning came in the boxed case. So assume that $\beta \not\mathcal{R} \gamma$. By the induction hypothesis for D and γ, we have

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F(f_D(x))\mathcal{R}\gamma \wedge \Box_x D^\Diamond\right) \to \Box_{f_D(x)}\left((L = \gamma \wedge \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \to \neg d(D,\gamma,f_D^\gamma(x))\right)$$

  On the other hand, by Lemma 5.11, we have

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \Box_x D^\Diamond \to \Box_{f_D(x)} d(D,\gamma,f_D^\gamma(x))$$

  Hence

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F(f_D(x))\mathcal{R}\gamma \wedge \Box_x D^\Diamond\right) \to \Box_{f_D(x)}\left(\neg(L = \gamma \wedge \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)\right) \tag{10}$$

We argue inside HA_m. Assume $F(f_E(x))\mathcal{R}\beta$ and $\Box_x E^\Diamond$. Since $f_E(x) \geq f_D(f_E^\beta(x))$, by the assumption of $F(f_E(x))\mathcal{R}\beta$, we have $F(f_D(f_E^\beta(x)))\mathcal{R}\gamma$, and by Lemma 3.6, we get $\Box_m(F(f_D(f_E^\beta(x)))\mathcal{R}\gamma)$. Hence if we replace $f_E^\beta(x)$ for x in Equation 10, we may deduce

$$\Box_m \left(\Box_{f_E^\beta(x)} D^\Diamond \to \Box_{f_D(f_E^\beta(x))} \neg (L = \gamma \wedge \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \right) \tag{11}$$

Now we work inside $\Box_{f_E(x)}$. We have $F(f_E(x))\mathcal{R}\beta$. Assume $\Box_{f_E^\beta(x)} D^\Diamond$ and $L = \beta$ and $\Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond$. We should deduce $\bot$. From $\Box_{f_E^\beta(x)} D^\Diamond$ and Equation 11, we have $\Box_{t(x)} \neg(L = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$, in which $t(x) := f_D(f_B^\beta(x))$. So there exists some y_1 such that $\mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{HA}_{t(x)}}(y_1, \ulcorner \neg(L = \gamma \wedge \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \urcorner)$. Also by $L = \beta$, there exists some $y_2 \geq y_1$ such that $\forall z \geq y_2 F(z) = \beta$. Let some y greater than $\langle 2, \gamma \rangle^* y_2$ and $t(x)$. If $r(\beta, y+1) \leq t(x)$, then $\Box_{t(x)} \neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. Now, since $f_E(x) \geq h_\beta(t(x))$ and we are working in $\Box_{f_E(x)}$, by Lemma 3.12, we have $\neg(L = \beta \wedge \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$ and hence $\bot$. If $t(x) < r(\beta, y+1)$, since $r(\gamma, y+1) \leq t(x)$, by recursive definition of F, then $F(y+1) = \gamma$, which contradicts with $L = \beta$.

❑

Corollary 5.13. *For each $B \in S$ and $\beta \in K$ such that $\beta \nVdash_{\mathsf{max}} B$,*

$$\mathsf{HA}_m \vdash \left(F\left(f_B\left(x\right)\right) \mathcal{R}\beta \wedge \Box_x B^\Diamond \right) \to \Box_{f_B(x)} \neg \left(L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond \right)$$

Proof. Use Lemma 5.12 for $E = B$. Then by (Equation 6) and Lemma 5.11, one can deduce the desired result. ❑

Theorem 5.14. *For each $B \in S$, and $\alpha \in K$ such that $\alpha \nVdash \Box B$,*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \alpha \to \neg \Box B^\Diamond$$

Proof. ¿From $\alpha \nVdash \Box B$, we conclude that there exists some $\beta \in K$ such that $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$ and $\beta \nVdash_{\mathsf{max}} B$. Now Corollary 5.13 implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \alpha \wedge \Box B^\Diamond) \to \Box \neg (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 5.6, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \alpha \to \neg \Box \neg (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. Hence $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \alpha \wedge \Box B^\Diamond) \to \bot$, as desired. ❑

5.4 The Solovay function is a constant function

In this subsection, we will show that $L = \alpha_0$ is a true statement in the standard model (Theorem 5.25). This fact is necessary for showing that for any $\alpha \in K$, the theory $L = \alpha + \mathsf{PA}$ is consistent.

Lemma 5.15. *For each $\alpha \lneqq \beta \in K$ with $\alpha \not\mathcal{R} \beta$,*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \alpha \to \Box^+ \neg (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$$

Proof. By Π_2 conservativity of PA over HA, it is enough to prove the above assertion in PA instead of HA. We work inside PA. Fix some x such that $F(x) = \alpha$. Then for each $y \leq x$, we have $F(y) \preccurlyeq \alpha$. Now, work inside $\Box^+$. Assume $L = \beta$ and $\Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond$. Then there exists some minimum z such that $F(z+1) = \beta$. So there exists some δ such that $F(z) = \delta$. Since $F(x) = \alpha$, we have $\beta \gneqq \delta \geq \alpha$. Hence $\delta \not\mathcal{R} \beta$. So by recursive definition of F, $r(\beta, z+1) < r(\delta, z+1)$ and $F(r(\beta, z+1))\mathcal{R}\beta$. Since $\alpha \not\mathcal{R} \beta$, we have $F(r(\beta, z+1)) \gneqq F(x) = \alpha$, which implies $r(\beta, z+1) < x$. Since $x \leq z$, we have $r(\beta, z+1) < z$ and hence $\Box_x \neg (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. Thus by Lemma 3.7, $\neg(L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$, that is a contradiction. ❑

Lemma 5.16. *For any $\beta \in K$ and $B \in S$,*

- *if $\beta \Vdash B$, then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \beta \wedge \Box \varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to B^\Diamond$,*

- *if* $\beta \nVdash B$ *and any occurrence of* $\to$ *in* B *is in the scope of some* $\Box$ $(B \in \mathsf{NOI})$*, then* $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to \neg B^\Diamond$.

Proof. We prove the items by induction on the complexity of B.

- B is atomic. Then, by definition of the substitution $\sigma(\cdot)$, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash B^\Diamond \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{\gamma \Vdash B} \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma$. If $\beta \Vdash B$, then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \beta \to B^\Diamond$. If $\beta \nVdash B$, then for each $\gamma \Vdash B$, we have $\gamma \not\leq \beta$, and hence by Lemma 5.5(1), $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \beta \to \neg\exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma$. Hence $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \beta \to \neg B^\Diamond$.
- B is conjunction or disjunction. We have the desired conclusions by the induction hypotheses.
- $B = \Box C$. First assume $\beta \Vdash \Box C$. Then, by definition of $\varphi_\beta^\Diamond$, $C^\Diamond$ is a conjunct of $\varphi_\beta^\Diamond$, and then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to B^\Diamond$. For the other side, assume $\beta \nVdash \Box C$. Then Theorem 5.14 implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \beta \to \neg\Box C^\Diamond$.
- $B = C \to D$. Since B is TNNIL, we have $B \in \mathsf{NOI}$. First assume that $\beta \Vdash C \to D$. If $\beta \Vdash C$, then $\beta \Vdash D$, and hence by the induction hypothesis,

  $$\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to (C^\Diamond \to D^\Diamond).$$

  If $\beta \nVdash C$, then again by the induction hypothesis, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to \neg C^\Diamond$, and hence $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \beta \wedge \Box\varphi_\beta^\Diamond) \to (C^\Diamond \to D^\Diamond)$.

❑

Lemma 5.17. *Let* $\alpha \in K$ *and for each* $\beta \geq \alpha$*, we have* $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \beta \mathcal{R} L \to \varphi_\beta^\Diamond$*. Then for each* $\beta \geq \alpha$ *and* $\gamma \gneqq \beta, \beta \not\mathcal{R} \gamma$*,*

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box^+ L \neq \gamma$$

Proof. Fix some $\beta \geq \alpha$. We use induction on γ. Suppose that for each $\gamma_0 \gneqq \gamma \gneqq \beta$ with $\beta \not\mathcal{R} \gamma_0$, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box^+ L \neq \gamma_0$. Then

$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box^+ \neg(L = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$	Lemma 5.15
$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box^+((\exists x F(x) = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \to L \neq \gamma)$	
$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box^+((\exists x F(x) = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \to \gamma \mathcal{R} L)$	induction hypothesis
$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box(\exists x F(x) = \gamma \to (\Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond \to \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond))$	hypothesis of lemma and Lemma 3.2
$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box(\exists x F(x) = \gamma \to \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$	Löb's axiom, Σ_1-completeness of HA

This in combination with $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box^+ \neg(L = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$ implies

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \beta \to \Box^+ L \neq \gamma$$

❑

Lemma 5.18. *For any* $\gamma \in K_0$*,* $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \gamma \to \Box^+ \neg(L = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$.

Proof. We work inside PA. Assume $\exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma$. There exists a minimum x_0 such that $F(x_0) = \gamma$. Then by recursive definition of F, we have $F(x) \prec F(x_0)$, for all $x < x_0$, and $F(x_0 \dot{-} 1) = \beta$, and one of the following cases holds:

1. $\beta \mathcal{R} \gamma$ and $r(\gamma, x_0) \leq x_0$, by definition of r, we can deduce

   $$\exists x \leq_0 \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{PA}}(x, \ulcorner \neg(L = \gamma \wedge \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \urcorner)$$

   and then $\Box^+ \neg(L = \gamma \wedge \Box\varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$.

2. $\beta \mathcal{R} \gamma, \beta \prec \gamma$ and $r(\gamma, x_0) < r(\beta, x_0)$. Because $r(\beta, x_0) \leq x_0 + 1$, we can deduce $r(\gamma, x_0) \leq x_0$. By repeating the above argument, we get $\Box^+ \neg (L = \gamma \wedge \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$.

❑

Lemma 5.19. *Let $\beta \in K_0$ and for each $\gamma \geq \beta$, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \gamma \mathcal{R} L \to \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond$. Then for each $\gamma \geq \beta$, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \to \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.18, $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \to \Box^+ \neg (L = \gamma \wedge \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$. Then Lemma 3.2 implies

$$\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \to \Box^+ \neg (L = \gamma \wedge \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma &\to \Box^+ (\Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond \to L \neq \gamma) \\
\text{(by } \Sigma_1\text{-completeness and Lemma 5.5)} \quad &\to \Box^+ (\Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond \to L \succ \gamma) \\
\text{(by Lemma 5.17 and Lemma 5.5)} \quad &\to \Box^+ (\Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond \to \gamma \mathcal{R} L) \\
\text{(by } \Pi_2\text{-conservativity of PA over HA)} \quad &\to \Box (\Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond \to \gamma \mathcal{R} L) \\
\text{(by hypothesis)} \quad &\to \Box (\Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond \to \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \\
\text{(Löb's axiom)} \quad &\to \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond
\end{aligned}$$

❑

Lemma 5.20. *Let $\beta \in K_0$ and let for each $\gamma \geq \beta$, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \gamma \mathcal{R} L \to \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond$. Then for each $\gamma \geq \beta$ and $B \in S$, $\gamma \Vdash B$ implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \to B^\Diamond$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on the frame $(K, \lneqq)$ with reverse order. Let some $\gamma \geq \beta$ and as the (first) induction hypothesis, assume that for each $\gamma_0 \gneqq \gamma$ and $B \in S$, if $\gamma_0 \Vdash B$, then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \gamma_0 \to B^\Diamond$. We will show that for each $B \in S$, if $\gamma \Vdash B$, then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \gamma \to B^\Diamond$. We prove this by a (second) induction on the complexity of $B \in S$. Let some $B \in S$ and $\gamma \Vdash B$ and as the (second) induction hypothesis, assume that for each $C \in S$ with lower complexity than B (i.e. C is a strict sub-formula of B) such that $\gamma \Vdash C$, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \gamma \to C^\Diamond$. We will show $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \gamma \to B^\Diamond$. We have following cases.

- B is atomic. It is trivial by definition of $B^\Diamond$.
- B is conjunction or disjunction. The result follows easily by (second) induction hypothesis.
- $B = \Box C$. Suppose that $\gamma \Vdash \Box C$. Then by definition of φ_γ, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond \to \Box C^\Diamond$. Now the result is a consequence of Lemma 5.19.
- $B = C \to D \in S$ and C does not have an occurrence of implication which is not in the scope of any box. Suppose that $\gamma \Vdash C \to D$. There are two sub-cases.
  1. $\gamma \Vdash C$. Then, by (second) induction hypothesis, we can derive $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \to D^\Diamond$, and hence $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \to (C^\Diamond \to D^\Diamond)$.
  2. $\gamma \nVdash C$. Then Lemma 5.16 implies that $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (L = \gamma \wedge \Box \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond) \to \neg C^\Diamond$, and by Lemma 5.19, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \gamma \to \neg C^\Diamond$. Now we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash C^\Diamond \to L \neq \gamma$ and hence

     $$\mathsf{HA} \vdash (\exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \wedge C^\Diamond) \to L \neq \gamma$$

     So $\mathsf{PA} \vdash (\exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \wedge C^\Diamond) \to L \neq \gamma$. Then by Lemma 5.5(3)

     $$\mathsf{PA} \vdash (\exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \wedge C^\Diamond) \to L \succ \gamma$$

On the other hand, C is implication-free and $C^\Diamond$ is Σ_1, so by Lemma 3.2, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (\exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \wedge C^\Diamond) \to L \succ \gamma$. For arbitrary $\gamma_0 \gneqq \gamma$, we have $\gamma_0 \Vdash C \to D$. So by the first induction hypothesis, we can derive $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x F(x) = \gamma_0 \to (C \to D)^\Diamond$. By definition of $\gamma \prec L$, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \gamma \prec L \to (C \to D)^\Diamond$. Hence $\mathsf{HA} \vdash (\exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \wedge C^\Diamond) \to (C^\Diamond \to D^\Diamond)$, which implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \gamma \to (C^\Diamond \to D^\Diamond)$.

❑

Lemma 5.21. *For any $\alpha \in K$, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \alpha \mathcal{R} L \to \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$.*

Proof. Our proof is by reverse induction on the frame $(K, \lneqq)$. As the induction hypothesis, assume that for each $\beta \gneqq \alpha$, we have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \beta \mathcal{R} L \to \varphi_\beta^\Diamond$. For each β with $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$, by definition of φ_α, we have $\beta \Vdash \varphi_\alpha$. Hence by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.20, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \beta \to \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$. Then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \bigvee_{\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta} \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \beta \to \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$, which implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \alpha \mathcal{R} L \to \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$. ❑

As a direct consequence of Lemma 5.19 and Lemma 5.21 we have the following result.

Corollary 5.22. *For any $\alpha \in K_0$, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \exists x (F(x) = \alpha) \to \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$.*

Let $\mathbb{N}$ indicates the standard model of arithmetic.

Lemma 5.23. *Let $\alpha \in K$ and $\mathbb{N} \models L = \alpha$. Then $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \alpha \prec L \to \alpha \mathcal{R} L$.*

Proof. Assume $\alpha \lneqq \beta$ and $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$. Lemma 5.21 implies that for each $\gamma \geq \alpha$, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \gamma \mathcal{R} L \to \varphi_\gamma^\Diamond$. So Lemma 5.17 implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash L = \alpha \to \Box^+ L \neq \beta$. Then $\mathbb{N} \models L = \alpha \to \Box^+ L \neq \beta$, which implies $\mathsf{PA} \vdash L \neq \beta$. Hence $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \alpha \prec L \to \alpha \mathcal{R} L$. Now by Π_2-conservativity of PA over HA, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \alpha \prec L \to \alpha \mathcal{R} L$. ❑

Lemma 5.24. *Let $\alpha \in K$ and $\mathbb{N} \models L = \alpha$. Then $\mathsf{PA} \cup \{L = \alpha, \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond\}$ is consistent.*

Proof. Suppose not, i.e., $\mathsf{PA} \vdash (L = \alpha \wedge \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \to \bot$. Then $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \to L \neq \alpha$. By Σ_1-completeness of PA, we have $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \exists x \bar{F}(x) = \alpha$ and then by Lemma 5.5, $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \to L \succ \alpha$. By Π_2-conservativity of PA over HA, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \to L \succ \alpha$. Lemma 5.23 implies $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \to \alpha \mathcal{R} L$. Then by Lemma 5.21, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond \to \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$. Then by Löb's theorem, $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$. Hence $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond$. That implies $PA \vdash L \neq \alpha$, a contradiction with $\mathbb{N} \models L = \alpha$. ❑

Theorem 5.25. $\mathbb{N} \models L = \alpha_0$.

Proof. Suppose not, i.e., $\mathbb{N} \models L \neq \alpha_0$. Then by Lemma 5.5(2 and 3), $\mathbb{N} \models L = \alpha$, for some $\alpha > \alpha_0$. Then by Lemma 5.18, $\mathbb{N} \models \exists x F(x) = \alpha \to \Box^+ \neg (L = \alpha \wedge \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond)$. This implies $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \neg (L = \alpha \wedge \Box \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond)$, a contradiction with Lemma 5.24. ❑

Corollary 5.26. *For any $\alpha \leq \beta \in K$ we have $(L = \alpha \wedge \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \rhd (L = \beta \wedge \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$.*

Proof. We should show that $\mathbb{N} \models (L = \alpha \wedge \varphi_\alpha^\Diamond) \rhd (L = \beta \wedge \varphi_\beta^\Diamond)$. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.25, Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.6. ❑

5.5 Proof of the main theorem

In this subsection, we will prove Theorem 5.1.

With the general method of constructing Kripke models for HA, invented by Smoryński [Smo73b], interpretability of theories containing PA plays an important role in constructing Kripke models of HA.

Definition 5.27. *A triple $\mathcal{I} := (K, <, T)$ is called an I-frame iff it has the following properties:*

- *$(K, <)$ is a finite tree,*

- *T is a function from K to arithmetical r.e consistent theories containing* PA ,
- *if $\beta < \gamma$, then T_β interprets T_γ ($T_\beta \rhd T_\gamma$).*

Theorem 5.28. *For every I-frame $\mathcal{I} := (K, <, T)$ there exists a first-order Kripke model $\mathcal{K} = (K, <, \mathfrak{M})$ such that $\mathcal{K} \Vdash \mathsf{HA}$ and moreover $\mathfrak{M}(\alpha) \models T_\alpha$ for any $\alpha \in K$. Note that both of the I-frame and Kripke-model are sharing the same frame $(K, <)$.*

Proof. See [Smo73b, p. 372-7]. For more detailed proof of a generalization of this theorem, see [AM, Theorem 4.8]. ❑

Lemma 5.29. *For any $\beta \in K_0$, let $T_\beta := PA \cup \{L{=}\beta\}$ and define $\mathcal{I} := (K_0, <_0, T)$. Then*

1. *$\mathcal{I}$ is an I-frame.*
2. *There exists a first-order Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1 := (K_0, <_0, \mathfrak{M})$ of HA such that for all $\beta \in K_0$ and all $B \in S$, $\mathcal{K}_0, \beta \Vdash B$ iff $\mathcal{K}_1, \beta \Vdash B^\Diamond$.*

Proof. 1. Corollary 5.26 implies that for each $\alpha \leq \beta$, $T_\alpha \rhd T_\beta$. Moreover, Lemma 5.24 implies that T_{α_0} is consistent. These finish the requirements of $\mathcal{I}$ to be an I-frame.

2. By Theorem 5.28, we can find a first-order Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1 := (K_0, <_0, \mathfrak{M})$, such that for all $\beta \in K_0$, $\mathfrak{M}(\beta) \models T_\beta$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 \Vdash \mathsf{HA}$. Now we prove, by induction on the complexity of $B \in S$, that for all $\beta \in K_0$, $\mathcal{K}_0, \beta \Vdash B$ iff $\mathcal{K}_1, \beta \Vdash B^\Diamond$.
   - B is atomic. Then by definition, $B^\Diamond := \bigvee_{\gamma \Vdash B} L \succeq \gamma$. For left to right direction, let $\beta \Vdash B$. By second part of Lemma 5.5, $T_\beta \vdash \bigvee_{\gamma \Vdash B} L \succeq \gamma$ and hence $\mathfrak{M}(\beta) \models \bigvee_{\gamma \Vdash B} L \succeq \gamma$. Since $\bigvee_{\gamma \Vdash B} L \succeq \gamma$ is Σ_1-formula, by Lemma 3.8, we will have $\beta \Vdash \bigvee_{\gamma \Vdash B} L \succeq \gamma$. For the other way around, let $\beta \nVdash B$. Then Lemma 5.5(2) implies $T_\beta \vdash \neg L \succeq \gamma$, for all $\gamma \Vdash B$. This implies that $\mathfrak{M}(\beta) \not\models L \succeq \gamma$, which by use of Lemma 3.8 implies $\beta \nVdash L \succeq \gamma$. So $\beta \nVdash \bigvee_{\gamma \Vdash B} L \succeq \gamma$.
   - B is conjunction, disjunction or implication. Result follows easily by induction hypothesis and inductive definition of $\Vdash$.
   - $B = \Box C$. Let $\beta \Vdash B$. Then by definition of φ_β and Corollary 5.22, $T_\beta \vdash \Box C^\Diamond$, and so $\beta \models \Box C^\Diamond$. By Lemma 3.8, $\beta \Vdash \Box C^\Diamond$. For the other way around, suppose $\beta \nVdash \Box C$. Then Theorem 5.14 implies $T_\beta \vdash \neg \Box C^\Diamond$ and hence $\mathfrak{M}(\beta) \not\models \Box C^\Diamond$. Then Lemma 3.8 implies $\beta \nVdash \Box C^\Diamond$.

❑

Proof. (of Theorem 5.1) Let $\mathcal{K}_1$ be as we have by Lemma 5.29 and σ be the substitution that we have defined at the beginning of this section. Let $A \in \mathsf{Sub}(\Gamma)$. We will show that for all $\alpha \in K_0$,

$$\mathcal{K}_0, \alpha \Vdash A \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{K}_1, \alpha \Vdash A^\Diamond \tag{12}$$

Since $\Gamma \subseteq \mathsf{TNNIL}^-$, there exist some $B_1, \ldots, B_n \in \mathsf{TNNIL}$ and some non-modal $A_0(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ such that $A = A_0(\Box B_1, \ldots, \Box B_n)$. Now we use induction on the complexity of A_0 to show that Equation 12 holds. When A_0 is atomic, we have $A \in \mathsf{TNNIL}$ and hence the desired result holds by Lemma 5.29. The other cases are deduced the by induction hypothesis and definition of $\Vdash$ in Kripke-models. ❑

6 The Σ_1-provability logic of HA

In this section, we will show that $\mathcal{PL}_\sigma(\mathsf{HA}) = \mathsf{H}_\sigma$. Moreover, we will show that H_σ is decidable. As a by-product of Theorem 5.1, we show that $\mathsf{HA} + \Box\bot$ has de Jongh property. Before we continue with the statement and proof of soundness and completeness theorem, let us apply our techniques presented in this paper to two well-known examples that have already been proved that don't belong to the provability logic of HA.

Example 6.1. Let $A = \Box(p \vee q) \to (\Box p \vee \Box q)$. H. Friedman showed in [Fri75] that there exists some first-order arithmetical formulas B and C such that $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \Box(B \vee C) \to (\Box B \vee \Box C)$, in other words, there exists some arithmetical substitution σ such that $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$.
First of all note that the following Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_0$ is a counter-model for A.



$$\beta \Vdash p \quad , \quad \beta \nVdash q \quad , \quad \gamma \Vdash q \quad , \quad \gamma \nVdash p \quad \text{and}$$
$$\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta \quad , \quad \alpha \mathcal{R} \gamma \quad , \alpha \leq \beta \quad , \quad \alpha \leq \gamma$$

Then by Theorem 5.1, there exists some first-order Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1 \Vdash \mathsf{HA}$ and some Σ_1-substitution σ such that $\mathcal{K}_1 \nVdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$. Hence we have $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$, in other words, if we define $B := \sigma(p)$ and $C := \sigma(q)$, then we have $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \Box(B \vee C) \to (\Box B \vee \Box C)$.
Let us explain a little more about the substitution σ and the Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1$ in this special example. For definition of σ, we first define a recursive function F in the following way. Let α_0 be a fresh node and add it to the beneath of all other nodes of $\mathcal{K}_0$, i.e. $\alpha_0 \mathcal{R} \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ and $\alpha_0 \leq \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$. Then put $F(0) := \alpha_0$ and for all x, define $F(x+1) \in \{\alpha_0, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ recursively as follows:

$$F(x+1) := \begin{cases} \lambda & \text{if } F(x) R \lambda \text{ and } x_0 = \lambda \text{ and} \\ & \exists y \leq x \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{PA}}(y, \ulcorner \text{“The function } F \text{ is not going to stay in } \lambda \text{ forever”} \vee \neg \varphi_\lambda \urcorner) \\ F(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

in which $\varphi_\alpha := \Box(\sigma(p) \vee \sigma(q))$, $\varphi_\beta := \Box\sigma(p)$, $\varphi_\gamma := \Box\sigma(q)$ and finally

$$\sigma(p) := \bigvee_{\lambda \Vdash p} (\exists x F(x) = \lambda) := \exists x F(x) = \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(q) := \bigvee_{\lambda \Vdash q} (\exists x F(x) = \lambda) := \exists x F(x) = \gamma$$

By theorems and lemmas of section 5, we have

- the function F with the above properties exists,
- for $\lambda \in \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$, the following theories are consistent:

$$T_\lambda := \mathsf{PA} + \text{“The limit of the function } F \text{ is } \lambda\text{”}$$

- $T_\lambda \vdash \varphi_\lambda$ and also $T_\alpha \vdash \neg\Box\sigma(p)$ and $T_\alpha \vdash \neg\Box\sigma(q)$,
- T_{λ_1} interprets T_{λ_2}, for all $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$.

Then we define the Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1$ with the same frame of $\mathcal{K}_0$, such that the classical model attached to the node λ, $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda$, be a model of T_λ. Since T_{λ_1} interprets T_{λ_2}, for all $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$, we can deduce $\mathcal{K}_1 \Vdash \mathsf{HA}$. This in combination with the above list of properties for F, implies that $\mathcal{K}_1$ simulates the behaviour of $\mathcal{K}_0$, i.e. for arbitrary $B \in \mathsf{Sub}(A)$:

$$\mathcal{K}_0, \lambda \Vdash B \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \mathcal{K}_1, \lambda \Vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(B)$$

Example 6.2. In this example, we show that how to refute $A = \neg\neg\Box(\neg\neg p \to p) \to \Box(\neg\neg p \to p)$ from the provability logic of HA and also from the Σ_1-provability logic of HA. First we compute the TNNIL-approximation of A, i.e. A^+. By TNNIL-algorithm (subsubsection 4.1.3), $A^+ = \Box(p \vee \neg p) \vee \neg\Box(p \vee \neg p)$. Then we have the following counter-model $\mathcal{K}_0$ for A^+:



$\alpha, \beta \nVdash p \quad , \quad \gamma \Vdash p \quad , \quad$ and

$\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta, \gamma \quad , \quad \alpha \leq \beta, \gamma \quad , \quad \beta \leq \gamma \quad , \quad \beta \not\mathcal{R} \gamma$

Then by Theorem 5.1, there exists some first-order Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1 \Vdash \mathsf{HA}$ and some Σ_1-substitution σ such that $\mathcal{K}_1 \nVdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^+)$. Hence $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^+)$. Since $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(\Box A \leftrightarrow \Box A^+)$ (Corollary 4.7), we can deduce $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$.

Soundness

Theorem 6.3. H_σ *is sound for* Σ_1*-arithmetical interpretations in* HA*, i.e.* $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{PL}_\sigma(\mathsf{HA})$.

Proof. We must show that Σ-substitutions of all axioms of H_σ hold in HA. For a proof that Σ-substitution of axioms $\Box A \to \Box B$ with $A \blacktriangleright B$, hold in HA, see [Vis02], Theorem 10.2. The other axioms are well-known or obvious, except for the Extended Leivant's principle, which holds by Theorem 3.19. ❑

Completeness

Theorem 6.4. Σ_1*-arithmetical interpretations in* HA *are complete for* H_σ*, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{PL}_\sigma(\mathsf{HA}) \subseteq \mathsf{H}_\sigma$$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \nvdash \mathsf{A}$. Then by Corollary 4.18, $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \nvdash \mathsf{A}^-$. Then by Theorem 4.4.1, $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \nvdash (\mathsf{A}^-)^*$, which implies $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \nvdash \mathsf{A}^+$. Hence $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \nvdash A^+$ and by Theorem 4.23, $\mathsf{LC} \nvdash A^+$. Then by Theorem 4.25, there exists some Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_0$ such that $\mathcal{K}_0 \nVdash A^+$. Then by Theorem 5.1, we can find some Σ_1-substitution σ and some first-order Kripke model $\mathcal{K}_1$, such that $\mathcal{K} \Vdash \mathsf{HA}$ and $\mathcal{K} \nVdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^+)$. Hence $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A^+)$. Now Corollary 4.8.1 implies $\mathsf{HA} \nvdash \sigma_{\mathsf{HA}}(A)$, as desired. ❑

Although the axioms of the theory H_σ sounds very complicated, however we have the following surpring result.

Theorem 6.5. Σ_1*-provability logic of* HA (H_σ) *is decidable.*

Proof. Let A be a given modal proposition. We explain how to decide $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \vdash \mathsf{A}$ or $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \nvdash \mathsf{A}$. First by TNNIL algorithm, compute A^+. Then by Theorem 4.26, we can decide $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A^+$. If $\mathsf{LC} \vdash A^+$, we say 'yes" to $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \vdash \mathsf{A}$, and otherwise we say "no" to $\mathsf{H}_\sigma \vdash \mathsf{A}$. Proof of the completeness theorem (Theorem 6.4) guarantees validity of the algorithm.

❑

Theorem 6.6. $\mathsf{HA} + \Box\bot$ *has the de Jongh property, i.e. for all non-modal proposition* A*,* $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash A$ *iff for all arithmetical substitution* σ*,* $\mathsf{HA} + \Box\bot \vdash \sigma(A)$.

Proof. If $\mathsf{IPC} \vdash A$, we apparently have $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \sigma(A)$, for all σ, and hence $\mathsf{HA} + \Box\bot \vdash \sigma(A)$.

For the other way around, let $\mathsf{IPC} \nvdash A$. Hence by Theorem 4.4.1, $\mathsf{IPC} \nvdash A^*$. Then by Theorem 4.27, $\mathsf{LC} \nvdash \Box\bot \to A^*$. This implies that $\mathsf{LLe}^+ \nvdash \Box\bot \to A^*$. Hence by Theorem 5.1, there exists some substitution σ such that $\mathsf{HA} + \Box\bot \nvdash \sigma(A)$, as desired. ❑

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank Albert Visser for reading of the first draft of this paper and his very helpful comments, remarks and corrections. Some results of of this paper is obtained during the second author's visit to the Department of Philosophy in Utrecht University in May-June 2011. The second author is thankful to Albert Visser who patiently answered to his questions and having very fruitful conversations. The second author is also very thankful to Jeroen Goudsmit for his helps, hospitality and conversations.

References

[AB04] S. Artemov and L. Beklemishev, *Provability logic*, in Handbook of Philosophical Logic (D. Gabbay and F. Guenthner, eds.), vol. 13, Springer, 2nd ed., 2004, pp. 189–360.

[AM] M. Ardeshir and S. M. Mojtahedi, *The de jongh property for basic arithmetic*, Archive for Mathematical Logic, 2014, DOI:10.1007/s00153-014-0394-7.

[Ber90] A. Berarducci, *The interpretability logic of Peano arithmetic*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **55** (1990), no. 3, 1059–1089.

[BV06] L. Beklemishev and A. Visser, *Problems in the logic of provability*, Mathematical problems from applied logic. I, Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.), vol. 4, Springer, New York, 2006, pp. 77–136.

[Fef60] S. Feferman, *Arithmetization of metamathematics in a general setting*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **49** (1960), no. 1, 35–92 (eng).

[Fri75] Harvey Friedman, *The disjunction property implies the numerical existence property*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **72** (1975), no. 8, 2877–2878. MR 0379141 (52 #47)

[Göd31] K. Gödel, *Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I*, Monatsh. Math. Phys. **38** (1931), no. 1, 173–198.

[Göd33] ———, *Eine interpretation des intuitionistischen aussagenkalkuls*, Ergebnisse eines mathematischen Kolloquiums **4** (1933), 39–40, English translation in: S. Feferman etal., editors, Kurt Gödel Collected Works, Vol. 1, pages 301-303. Oxford University Press, 1995.

[Iem01] R. Iemhoff, *Provability logic and admissible rules*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2001.

[Lei75] D. Leivant, *Absoluteness in intuitionistic logic*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam, 1975.

[Smo73a] C. Smoryński, *Invesigations of intuitionistic formal systems by means of kripke models*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1973.

[Smo73b] C. A. Smoryński, *Applications of Kripke models*, Metamathematical investigation of intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis, Springer, Berlin, 1973, pp. 324–391. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 344.

[Smo85] C. Smoryński, *Self-reference and modal logic*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.

[Sol76] R. M. Solovay, *Provability interpretations of modal logic*, Israel J. Math. **25** (1976), no. 3-4, 287–304.

[TvD88] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, *Constructivism in mathematics. Vol. I*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 121, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1988, An introduction.

[Vis81] A. Visser, *Aspects of diagonalization and provability*, Ph.D. thesis, Utrecht University, 1981.

[Vis82] ———, *On the completeness principle: a study of provability in Heyting's arithmetic and extensions*, Ann. Math. Logic **22** (1982), no. 3, 263–295.

[Vis98] ———, *An overview of interpretability logic*, Advances in modal logic, Vol. 1 (Berlin, 1996), CSLI Lecture Notes, vol. 87, CSLI Publ., Stanford, CA, 1998, pp. 307–359.

[Vis02] ———, *Substitutions of Σ_1^0 sentences: explorations between intuitionistic propositional logic and intuitionistic arithmetic*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **114** (2002), no. 1-3, 227–271, Commemorative Symposium Dedicated to Anne S. Troelstra (Noordwijkerhout, 1999).

[VvBdJRdL95] A. Visser, J. van Benthem, D. de Jongh, and G. R. R. de Lavalette, NNIL*, a study in intuitionistic propositional logic*, Modal logic and process algebra (Amsterdam, 1994), CSLI Lecture Notes, vol. 53, CSLI Publ., Stanford, CA, 1995, pp. 289–326.